THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

"By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1929. Vol. XVIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

An Act of Reparation.

We have received from the Dean of St. Paul's the following letter, to which we desire to draw the attention of our readers:

To the Editor of the *Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

As Chairman of a Committee at King's College, London, for raising money to endow a 'Maurice' professorship of divinity at King's College, I venture to commend this project to the sympathy of Modern Churchmen. It is gratifying that it is supported by members of the Council of King's College without distinction of party, and that all (so far as I know) are in favour of paying this tribute of homage to a thinker who in his lifetime met with so much opposition. The name of Dr. W. R. Matthews, Dean of King's College, to whom donations may be sent, will further recommend the scheme to readers of the *Modern Churchman.*

W. R. Inge.

Deanery, St. Paul's, E.C.
November 19th.

We publish in this issue an article upon F. D. Maurice, by Canon C. E. Raven, which will remind Modernists (if they need reminding) how great is their debt to this pioneer; and we venture to hope that the Dean's letter will meet with a generous response.

The Votes of the Synods.

On December 12th, the *Manchester Guardian* published an interesting article, signed P.L., on the results of the Synod vot-

ing in twelve dioceses. The writer observed that though to the last Question (*Are you willing to support the bishop in endeavouring to secure that practices which are consistent neither with the book of* 1662 *nor with the book of* 1928 *shall cease?*) these twelve synods as a unit said 'Yes,' yet the votes of a thousand or more of their members who said 'No' cannot be ignored. The existence of these dissentients is an ominous feature of the situation, and must be a puzzle for the bishops. Moreover, to the first Question (asking whether the bishop, in the exercise of his legal or administrative discretion, may be guided by the book of 1928) there were 2,717 ayes (representing ten dioceses) and 1,573 noes (representing two); while to the Question about the permissive use of the new Canon there were 1,562 ayes and 1,691 noes. It was furthermore very interesting to note that a majority of the synods, *but a minority of their members*, approved of the 1928 reservation rubrics. The bishop's task of restoring discipline certainly remains a difficult, indeed an apparently impossible one.

Dr. Henson's Conversion.

So much so indeed that Dr. Henson has frankly proclaimed that Disestablishment is the only way of bringing recalcitrants to heel. Addressing the clergy of the Auckland Archdeaconry at Darlington on December 18th he is reported to have said that the inherent authority of the Church, which must be vindicated at all costs against the aggression of the State, must be vindicated also, and at all costs, against the lawless individualism of the clergy. Discipline within was the concomitant of independence without. Indiscipline, in short, cannot be dealt with under the present system of Establishment. In an article in the January *Nineteenth Century*, the bishop, with his usual trenchancy, makes his point clear :

> 'If the present situation be, as the Archbishop of York himself allows, *'in the strict and proper sense of the word intolerable,'* it would seem to call for immediate repudiation, not for an acquiescence, provisional indeed, but of undefined duration. But even if there were no objection in point of principle, such a provisional acquiescence could not be reasonably expected to secure its avowed object. *For it would perpetuate* (the italics are ours) *that paralysis of operative authority in the Church of England which is the very condition under which the lawless elements within the Church have been able hitherto to develop and organize themselves.'*

In other words the Establishment, with its latitude of belief and practice, has made possible beliefs and practices quite inconsistent with Anglican tradition. Therefore the Establishment, the shelter under which these licentious innovations have been introduced, must be removed.

This, to be sure, looks like common-sense; but nevertheless the policy thus outlined is a dangerous one. Disestablishment and its discipline may result in giving us a regimented and stereotyped clergy in a Church made safe for mediocrity; but is this what we want? Modernists might be no safer in it than the Anglo-Romans.

It is natural that Dr. Henson and the other bishops should feel sore at the organized obstruction which the Catholic party offers to their proposals, and of which the divisions revealed by the synods are good evidence. It is natural too that they should wish to subdue those whose behaviour generated the suspicions which wrecked the Prayer Book in Parliament. But Disestablishment is not the best method nor the most straightforward method (though it has that appearance) of regaining control.

Disestablishment or Reunion?

We shall not weary our readers by elaborating the very clear case against disestablishment. It is unlikely that the bishops will decide in January to follow Dr. Henson. An heroic policy is rarely a wise one, and the new Archbishop of York has already observed that 'the Establishment is of real religious value to the nation, and we must not throw away that real value which exists unless it is found incompatible with others that are greater.' Certainly those bishops who understand and sympathize with the difficulties of parochial clergymen will be unwilling to add to these by a policy of *sabotage*. The trouble is that some members of the episcopate entertain very inadequate notions on that score. Their own parochial experience (if they have had any) dates back to pre-war days when things were very different from what they now are. For bishops need not suppose that, when they visit parishes for Confirmations, and so on, they see things as they are. On the contrary, bishops on their parochial visitations bear no distant resemblance to those idealists who enjoy a conducted tour through holy Russia, and whose

benevolent guides conceal what might distress their feelings. No parochial clergyman who hopes for countenance and promotion troubles his diocesan more than he can help with his own parochial worries. He says nothing of an empty church and the perpetual hunt for money.

What we ourselves hope is that when the bishops meet they will agree to forget their rebuffs, and will settle down to devise a constructive policy of reunion in view of the Lambeth Conference of 1930. The new Archbishop of Canterbury, in his enthronement sermon on December 4th, which was broadcast throughout the country, definitely foreshadowed a policy of this sort.

> 'Within this Cathedral to-day are representatives of many Christian Churches from many lands. Their presence, welcomed and honoured, testifies to the width and depth of the desire for unity. God grant that it may become to all of us the constraint of a Divine call.'

This language, unless it is mere verbiage, and unless we are very much deceived, does appear to mean something. What it actually *will* mean depends very much on the courage of the bishops, and this in turn seems to depend on whether they have learnt the lesson of the rejected Prayer-book. That lesson, as we read it is, that if the bishops desire to be masters in their own household, they must not allow their policy to be deflected by appeals to Catholic prejudice. It is to the intransigent Catholic partisans that the rejection of the episcopal policy has been due. And in devising an effective scheme for Reunion, the bishops will have to meet similar opposition from the same quarter. Already the organ of the Catholic party has issued a warning (*Church Times*, December 28th) against 'the agitation already begun and certain to grow more intense next year, to persuade the Lambeth Conference to modify the claims of episcopacy.' We may be sure that Dr. Lang's sinister utterance, which we quoted alone, has not passed unnoticed, and ample precautions will already be in hand to ensure that (like similar utterances in 1920) it will never pass beyond words into action.

But if the bishops do give way over Reunion, they will be doing far more harm to the Church of England than could ever be done by winking at illegal liturgical practices. It is easy to exaggerate the importance of these eccentricities, practised by clergymen who individually, perhaps, do not cut very much ice.

But Reunion is a different matter, since it affects the whole future and outlook of the Church. To suffer this to slide for the sake of a handful of fanatics inadequately equipped with historical knowledge, would be a calamity. But, at the moment, and until we hear the results of the January deliberations, there is no need to say more upon this point. In any case, we take it that our bishops will be less tempted to surrender, now that they realize what are the results of timidity. Unhappily, there is a certain sort of adversary with whom no compromise is possible, however desirous one may be to make concessions.

While Rome Burns.

The tragedy of the situation is that while ecclesiastical persons wrangle over trifles, our younger generation, having looked up without being fed, is drifting into indifference and scepticism. In the *Spectator* for December 29th appears an interesting letter from one who signs himself 'An Undergraduate.' After having observed that the twentieth century is not restless and dissatisfied because it values material things too much, but because material things no longer satisfy it, he says :

> 'Of course, Youth is longing to relieve this discontent. Youth is certainly seeking for reality. But by reality it means truth and not God, knowledge and not emotion. Young people are on the side of the mind against the body, they lust for new knowledge and new ideas. If they are without a religion, and a little the worse for it, that is not their fault. In their ideas and speculations they are perfectly honest and sincere, and if the current religion does not convince them, they keep faith with themselves and pass it by.
>
> 'They do not wish it to be supposed that they can do nothing to improve modern life except by means of a religion handed to them from the past. If they are appealed to for help, they naturally expect those who appeal to accept new things from them, and not to look for Christianity where it does not belong. A new religion will come in time.'

Of course it is possible for Jones, who is sixty,—or for any bishop, for that matter—to pick holes in this. We did not transcribe the passage because we regarded it as inspired or infallible, but because it is illuminating. If the idealism of youth passes the Church by, would it not appear that something very grave is wrong? It looks as if the spiritually creative forces of the community were *outside* and not inside the Church. And if a Church is not the nurse and foster-mother of such forces, what useful service can it claim to perform? It were better dead. Alive, it cumbers the ground.

A FORE-RUNNER

By the Rev. Canon C. E. Raven.

OF Frederick Denison Maurice it has been written that 'among all the Churchmen of the nineteenth century it seems certain that we shall reckon him as incomparably the greatest alike in life, in vision and in achievement'; and though the verdict still seems to many an exaggeration, I am confident that as we see the Victorian era in truer perspective we shall find it justified. In his life-time his own intense humility, his refusal to create or lead a party, and the fact that his views were far ahead of those of his contemporaries encouraged them to set him down as a dreamer. If so, he unlike the majority of them was a dreamer whose dreams came true, and in coming true have brought nothing but good to mankind. Even now, although the facts ought to be familiar, hardly anyone gives to Maurice the credit that is his due. Here is the tale of his achievement: let it be compared with that of others.

Four great movements, each far more permanent and wide-reaching in its results than Tractarianism, owe to him their origin. He initiated and made possible the higher education of women, the application of Christianity to social and industrial life and its outcome in the Co-operative Movement; the higher education of the working-classes; and the Johannine or (if you will) the Modernist movement in theology. To have been responsible for any one of these would be proof of a life well spent: to have been the father of them all is a record that stands unique.

The first of his great works was the foundation of Queen's College for Ladies in 1847. As Chaplain of Guy's Hospital and a Professor at King's College he had seen and lamented the miserable conditions under which girls and women were at that period educated. The private governess, often herself almost wholly untrained, without opportunity for learning, ignorant of teaching, without status and miserably underpaid, was the sole instrument by which the well-to-do gave instruction to their daughters. Her curriculum was narrow and conventional, her position in the household precarious, her prospects determined more by her amiability than her capacity or knowledge: no

wonder her charges acquired little but a few superficial 'accomplishments' and were often almost illiterate. Maurice saw the evil; worked out a scheme for the higher education of women; and created the institution of which Girton and Lady Margaret are the offspring. His friend Tennyson, who was living near him at the time, might make his protest in the Princess: but as a prophet Maurice was more inspired than the poet.

Immediately afterwards he plunged into the movement called Christian Socialism—a title which carried a wider significance in those days than in these. I have described his work in it at length elsewhere,[1] and will only here remark that to condemn it because its scheme for Co-operative Production failed is to take a very mistaken outlook. The fact is that quite apart from the merits or demerits of the 'method of Association,' the influence of Maurice gathered together, inspired and directed a group of reformers whose work has changed the whole character of Christian effort and powerfully affected the social life of mankind. Ludlow, Neale and Hughes owed their work to Maurice's leadership: without them there would have been no legal recognition for the Co-operative Movement: Bishop Stubb's tribute,[2] 'the doctrine of Maurice turned the current of our English Christianity to the consideration of the great social problems of the age,' is wholly just.

Christian Socialism in its co-operative workshops failed; and Maurice was great enough to realize that the effort was premature, to see what was the chief reason of the failure, and to take steps to remedy it. With this in view he turned again to education, gathered his resources, and in 1852 initiated courses of lectures for working men. At this time came his dismissal from his professorship at King's College—one of the few serious blots upon the good name of the college, and due both to the incessant persecution of Maurice by the religious press (which then as now was almost invariably an obstacle to Christianity) and to the weakness of the Principal. One of his working-class friends, presenting to him an address of sympathy, suggested that 'he might not find it a fall to cease to be a Professor at King's College, and to become the Principal of a Working Men's College'; and the hint was promptly taken. In

[1] *Christian Socialism*, 1848-1854.
[2] *Charles Kingsley*, p. 16.

1854 the college was founded in Red Lion Square: in 1857 it was moved to Great Ormond Street: in 1905 new and vastly better buildings were opened in Crowndale Road, Camden Town, where the work is still carried on. Not only was this undertaking the forerunner of such work as is now done by the Workers' Educational Association on the one hand and by Ruskin College on the other, but by gathering together a large number of young lawyers, teachers, artists and scientists and interesting them in their artisan pupils, it directed many of the best minds of the time into social service and had an immense influence upon public opinion. Ruskin knew nothing of sociology till he was persuaded to take a class in the college: Miss Octavia Hill drew from it the inspiration for her housing reforms: Furnivall, Litchfield, the two Lushingtons, Lowes Dickinson and a succession of others have learnt from it what only such contact can give, an abiding passion for reform.

It is indeed almost incredible that one of whom Frederic Harrison could glibly write, 'A more utterly muddle-headed and impotent mind I have never known,'[3] one who confessed that 'I never could be acceptable to any schools in the Church,'[4] one who shrank from all public recognition and indeed in his life-time bore a name of reproach, could ever have accomplished three such prophetic and fruitful achievements. The secret of his discernment and of its practical results is not hard to discover. In an age when men were bewildered and paralysed by the impact upon thought and life of the scientific and industrial movements Maurice had fought his way through an agony of mental and spiritual struggle to a secure, consistent and unfaltering grasp upon the essentials of religion. At a time when theology was floundering between Evangelical fundamentalism and Tractarian mediaevalism Maurice dared to trust truth and to bring a very profound and patient and well-stored intellect to its interpretation. Almost alone among his peers he was never willing to take catchwords at their face-value; never lost his hold upon realities; never doubted that God had some better thing in store; never failed to test practical proposals by reference to abiding principles. Ludlow once accused him of being a digger rather than a builder: it is because he dug deep and

[3] *Autobiographic Memoirs*, i, p. 151.
[4] *Life of Maurice*, i, p. 181.

founded all his actions upon a basis of solid and coherent religion that his work possessed permanence and has stood the test of time. Other men accepted the ephemeral, and in a period of transition they and it are perishing. Maurice was content with nothing but the eternal, would not act until he had found it, and so built better than he knew. 'Maurice,' wrote Prof. Brentano,[5] 'was not merely guided in his general views by Christian doctrines; it was impossible for him to think of any aspect of nature or of social life otherwise than from the Christian point of view.' At a time when most men were content to keep their religion in a compartment like Lord Melbourne, or to identify it with dogma or texts, it was 'this complete drenching of his whole being in Christianity'[6] that gave him his saintliness of character, his consistency of mind, his breadth of sympathy, his influence upon the honest and the bewildered. 'I was sent into the world,' he writes in a moment of rare self-revelation, 'that I might persuade men to recognize Christ as the centre of their fellowship with one another, that so they might be united in their families, their countries, and as men, not in schools and factions.'[7] We are only just beginning to realize the scope and unifying power of such a faith.

It is this habit of delving into reality that gives his work its astonishing modernity of tone. At a time when the Church was rent with controversy over the minutiae of ecclesiasticism or convulsed with rage over the inroads of the new learning upon the historicity of Genesis, Maurice was able to lay down the lines of the theology which was 'idealized in the two great poets of the century, Tennyson and Browning, dominant in the teaching of Lightfoot and Westcott and Hort, assimilated almost unconsciously by the theologians of the *Lux Mundi* school.'[8] 'I find no man so simple, so clear, so resolute to keep himself and his readers out of limbo. I like him because he has no mythical explanations, no clever explaining away':[9] so wrote his friend and publisher.

He was not primarily concerned with Biblical criticism, for his interests were never destructive: but the story of Ruskin's quarrel with him shows how 'advanced' for his own date were

[5] *Chr.-soy. Bewegung*, p. 8.
[6] *Loc. cit.*
[7] *Life of Maurice*, i, p. 240.
[8] Stubbs, *loc. cit.*
[9] Hughes' *Memoir of Daniel Macmillan*, p. 284.

his views. Ruskin once came to Maurice's weekly Bible reading; and the morality of Deborah and Jael came up for discussion. Ruskin declares that to him the Song of the prophetess was as fully inspired as the Magnificat, and roundly accused Maurice of infidelity for calling its authoress an Amazon and condemning the murder of Sisera. Similar evidence comes from his notorious condemnation at King's College, where his offence was that of saying that eternal life was a state in which men could live even here on earth; or from his disagreement with the Tractarians whose error 'in opposing to τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου the spirit of a former age instead of the ever-living and acting Spirit of God' seemed to him a denial of the present organic life of Christianity; or from his readiness to welcome as wholly consistent with his belief in God's guidance the teaching of the *Origin of Species* and the critical position of Colenso. But no one who reads the religious literature of his day can fail to notice that whereas Newman and Pusey, Wordsworth and Spurgeon are speaking to us of bygone beliefs and in an unknown tongue, Maurice, like F. W. Robertson, has still his word to say, and that it is often a word that we are scarcely yet venturing to repeat.

If we are to classify him we shall place him in the great succession of Christian Platonists. His outlook is that of Clement and Origen, of Whichcote and Smith; and he spoke their message in an hour when its influence was desperately needed. Among circumstances entirely remade by the scientific and industrial movements, at a time when the Church was almost swept away from its moorings, among men wholly pre-occupied with conflicts about 'words and names and your law' he saw and proclaimed and applied in practice the essential realities of religion; and amid a cloud of misrepresentation and calumny in loneliness and humility blazed the trail along which the forward march of Christendom has slowly followed him.

He is a benefactor to a far wider world than that of the Church of England: but what the Church owes him is literally immeasurable. It is time, and more than time, that we who would desire to be his spiritual sons built a tomb in our prophet's honour.

THE COUP D'ÉTAT IN THE CHURCH

By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A.

I.

A *COUP D'ÉTAT* is an arbitrary stroke of policy carried out by unconstitutional means. A well-known example is that of Napoleon III, who in 1851 broke up the National Assembly, imprisoning many of the members and firing on the mob. The force employed need not be physical. When in 1870 Pius IX, with the approbation of the Vatican Council, defined the infallibility of the Pope, his action was described as *un colpo di stato di Domineddio—a coup d'état* of the Lord God; whose will this Pope was in the habit of identifying with his own. A similar *coup d'état* is taking place under our eyes in the Church of England. After a long and animated discussion the Prayer Book Revision measure was thrown out by the House of Commons on two separate occasions, in the December of 1927 and in June of last year. Both the sense of the country and the lay mind of the Church were with the House. A few weeks later five Episcopal sees, two of them Primatial, became vacant. All five were filled by pronounced supporters of the rejected measure. The effect was cumulative. Whether it was a *colpo di stato di Domineddio* is a matter of opinion. That it was a *colpo di Stato*, or *coup d'état*, and a revolutionary one, is a matter of fact.

II.

Once appointments in the public service have been made, the less they are criticized the better. They are seldom as important as we think them; and 'least said soonest mended' applies. But the present circumstances of the Church of England are not ordinary. The barometer has fallen ominously: no more point-blank opposition than that now existing between Parliament and—I will not say, and I do not mean, the Church—but the clerical and mixed assemblies which profess to represent it can be conceived. It can end only in one way.

> 'Never did men go to break Parliament' (said Pym) 'but Parliament broke them.'

But hierarchies are intolerant of opposition; 'an evil spirit from the Lord has come mightily upon Saul.' There is no general

desire for Disestablishment; and no political party wishes to see the Church made an election issue. But it is difficult to see how shipwreck is to be avoided unless the course of the ship is changed.

III.

The impression left by the recent ecclesiastical appointments is, it has been said, cumulative. And any criticism to which they may be open is not personal, but, in the larger sense of the word, political; it has in view not the qualities of individuals, but the interests of religion and of the Church. Such appointments lie outside party politics. But ecclesiastical influences are more subtle: here it seems to be a case of 'Heads I win; tails, you lose.' The nominations in question can only be justified on the assumption that the new Archbishops have statesmanship enough to recognize and to correct the mistakes that have been made. The most important of them was not unexpected; it had perhaps been made *in petto* beforehand. Of late years the administration of the Church has been increasingly centralized. The diocesan Bishops have become parts of a machine worked from headquarters rather than independent centres of action: *parvis componere magna*, one sees how in early days the Papacy grew up silently, and 'while men slept.' The result is that the Church of England has become rather an Archiepiscopal than an Episcopal Church: and, in view of the approaching Lambeth Conference of 1930, an abrupt change in the existing system, think of it as we will, was perhaps not to be expected: this would be to change horses while crossing a stream. What was essential was not that the new Primate should be either an anti-, or a pro-, Revisionist; but that he should be a man of business, conversant not only with ecclesiastical affairs but with the general situation, in touch with lay opinion, and capable of a certain detachment of mind. But it was thought that one, at least, of the Metropolitan sees would have been filled by a man who, if an advocate of the Revision measure rejected twice over by the House of Commons, had been moderate in his advocacy of it, and ready to admit that the question was one on which opinion might, and did, differ.

'I beseech you by the bowels of Christ to think it possible that you may be mistaken,'

said Cromwell to the Scottish preachers before Dunbar. They did not think it possible; and how the matter ended we know. So here. The distinguished man on whom the lot fell was the *fons et origo* of the mischievous agitation, of which the Enabling Act and the Revision controversy were the outcome. The outstanding danger of this agitation was, and is, that it may lead us, in the words of Professor Creed, 'to surrender our national heritage for the convenience of a well-managed episcopalian sect.'

> 'The "Life and Liberty" movement was,' he reminds us, 'a most misguided adventure. A Church which functions too actively at the centre will lose initiative in the country. We of the clergy ought not to try to found an autonomous clerical Kingdom within the Kingdom of King George, but rather to mediate the hopes, the principles and the beliefs which derive from a Kingdom "not of this world" throughout the length and breadth of our native land. The principle of public control promotes the attainment of this end: for it may, as occasion demands, prevent the Church from falling a victim to its own machinery.'[1]

IV.

'If a man desire the office of a Bishop, he desireth a good work.' This no doubt is so, and, as a wise Archbishop is said to have reminded a friend who spoke to him of its responsibilities, 'there are compensations.' But these compensations are fewer and smaller now than then; and, if it is still a good work, it is neither an easy nor, perhaps, a very enviable one. This is particularly the case since the passing of the Enabling Act during the period of hysteria which followed the war. This Act, if it did not disestablish the Church, went more than half-way to doing so. It

> 'disallowed the National theory on which the Church had hitherto justified its admittedly anomalous Establishment, and substituted a more coherent denominational theory, with which (says the Bishop of Durham) its Establishment is now seen to be incompatible. . . It will not be forgotten (he continues) that I did my best to prevent the passing of the Enabling Act. My attitude was mainly determined by the conviction that in principle the Act was one of Disestablishment. For, though in theory, such a complete autonomy of an Established Church as exists in Scotland might exist also in England, in fact the difference in history, habit, temper and conditions between the two Churches is so profound that the arrangement which has been found possible North of the Tweed would not be possible South of it.'[2]

[1] *The Review of the Churches*, October, 1928.
[2] *The Book and the Vote*, ix.

It is true. Often as it has been used for partisan purposes, no more misleading parallel than that between the two Churches can be conceived.

V.

Before, however, we admit the claims put forward for the Church Assembly and the lesser bodies which take part in its miscellaneous activities, let us look them in the face. When we do so we shall find that, as Jowett said of Convocation, 'the whole thing is a great sham.' What Archbishop Davidson, with characteristically Scottish good sense, calls 'wild and windy words' have not been wanting. One is lost in amazement when we are told by these 'who are reputed to be pillars' that it is

> 'no less than *outrageous* that a Churchman should appeal from the Assemblies of the Church to Parliament; and especially that he should actually invoke the aid of non-Churchmen in resistance to what the constitutional assemblies of the Church have approved. It belongs to the Church to be a unity controlling its own members. It has received authority from Christ Himself to do this; and this authority cannot be affected by any territorial State. And, though Henry VIII did blasphemously take this title to himself, the Lord alone is Head of the Church.' [3]

One wishes to speak with respect of beliefs which are apparently held seriously by serious men. But the English lay mind cannot, and never will, take these beliefs seriously. We seem to be listening to Mause Headrigg, in *Old Mortality*, testifying against a 'cauld soul-destroying Erastianism'; or, for extremes meet, to the Syllabus of Pius IX. Intolerable is the only word for such teaching in the Church of England. It is more intolerable, I venture to think, than those ritual and sacramental extravagances of which we reasonably complain, but which we are apt to see out of proportion. For, says Mark Pattison:

> 'Those rites and those doctrines which have made most noise in the Romanist controversy are those which are the least of the essence of Romanism. The Virgin and the Saints, Relics, Images, Purgatory and Masses are powerless decorations or natural developments. The one essential principle of the Catholic system is the control of the individual conscience by an authority or law placed without it, and exercised over it by men assuming to act in the name of Heaven.' [4]

[3] *The Manchester Churchman*, August, 1928.
[4] *Essay* ii, 255.

VI.

In a saner age than our own Dean Stanley reminded us that 'to say that Christ is the Head of the Church in any other sense than that in which He is the Head of all Churches and all States alike, is to clothe a very commonplace institution with a very splendid name.' The position that 'our Saviour is the Head of any particular Church in any temporal or legislative or judicial sense is one which can be dignified by no other name than an absurdity. The whole assumption is based on a mere misuse of words.'[5]

It is of the first importance that this should be recognized. To speak of the 'inherent spiritual authority of the Church,' or to describe any particular national Church, English or Scottish, as 'an autonomous spiritual society within the nation,' is to use what Hobbes calls 'insignificant (or meaningless) speech.' What *e.g.* is a 'spiritual society'? Does not the one note cancel the other? Again, like Esaias, a recent Diocesan Synod—that of Truro—'is very bold'; and saith—

> 'It is a fundamental principle that the Church must in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained by Synodical action, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its faith in Him, and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its form of worship.'

Here we find a hard and fast dividing-line drawn between the Church and the Christian nation. It is an unreal one. Such hard and fast lines exist for thought, not in things. Things are neither this nor that—but both, or neither, or something between the two. 'The good are not as good as they think themselves; and the bad are not as bad as the good think them,' says a wise man, who was also a Bishop—the late Bishop Creighton. The conclusion of the Synod, however, follows other lines; it is based on the assumption that the partial and partisan Assemblies which it identifies with the Church are 'the good'; and are entitled by their 'inherent spiritual authority' to revise the liturgy, to reserve the sacramental species, and to reintroduce the dogmatic standards and ceremonial of the Mass. Δῖνος βασιλεύει. 'Whirl is King, having deposed Zeus.' Those pre-

[5] *Essays on Church and State*, 354.

tensions call for the plainest possible language. The law knows nothing of them; it recognizes no such Church and no such authority. 'The clergy of England, when they cast off the Pope, submitted themselves to the Civil Power, and have so remained,' says Selden: the Sovereign is 'in all causes and over all persons, whether Ecclesiastical or Civil, within these his dominions supreme.'

VII.

The radical fallacy of Anglican Ecclesiasticism is that the nondescript assemblies, clerical and mixed, created under the Enabling Act represent the Church of England. Except by a transparent legal fiction, they do not represent it at all. From the first this Act caused searchings of heart to the wise. But people said that 'something must be done'—and when they do so, ten to one they do something foolish. The country was tired of controversy; a Nonconformist Prime Minister was caught napping; and Parliament, which cared neither one way nor the other, acquiesced. It was as the letting out of water. The title of the Church Assembly to replace Parliament as the organ of ecclesiastical legislation may be indisputable; but (says the Bishop of Durham) it is neither undisputed nor generally allowed. 'A surprisingly small proportion of the parochial electors have hitherto concerned themselves with the election of the House of Laity; and this circumstance, though it does not (so he urges) invalidate the representative claims of this body, cannot but detract from the impressiveness of its decisions.'[5] This is undoubtedly the case; and the argument that it does not invalidate their representative character is rather legal and technical than rational or real. We are told that the great majority of the clergy ardently desire the passing of the Revision Measure. Well, it was not passed; and the clergy, like other people, must obey the law. But I do not for a moment believe in their alleged enthusiasm for it. This exists only in the imagination of wire-pullers. Nolens volo is a common form of adhesion to synodical decisions: willing, but of unwilling mind. Let us tread lightly on thin ice. But Bishops, like other persons in authority, are apt to hear what they desire, or are

[5] *The Book and the Vote*, 14.

believed to desire, to hear; and in view of the various forms of pressure to which the clergy, who after all are human, are liable, the question of undue influence—in many cases no doubt unconsciously exercised and admitted—is not one which can be dismissed out of hand.

Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator. But few travel unencumbered—liberty is a matter of degree. The pressure need not, of course, be material. It may take the shape of *esprit de corps*; of respect, or *timor reverentialis*, for Bishops in general or in particular; of gratitude; of desire of office; of unwillingness to take risks. None of these motives are in themselves impossible, improbable or even blameworthy; we live in a mixed world. Many of those who supported the Revision Measure did so thinking it the lesser of two evils; which is a perfectly legitimate point of view. Only, do not call this state of mind one of enthusiastic adherence. It is nothing of the sort. As the Cambridge Professors of Divinity expressed it in their memorable letter in the *Times* of February 4th, 1928, which, though the Press did its best to stifle it, was by far the most important document of the many which have appeared during the controversy:

> 'The Revised Prayer Book is the product of diplomatic arrangements made by Bishops and other officials of the Church in the course of which fundamental spiritual issues were blurred. These issues are clearer to some of those who had no part in the negotiations than they were to some of the negotiators. In some of the provisions of the Revised Book the people of the Church of England scent a form of religion which their forefathers at the Reformation repudiated. They do not want it for themselves or their children. This is the really spiritual issue; and on it the House of Commons gauged the spiritual convictions of the Church better than the majority of the Bishops and the Church Assembly have hitherto done. If we are right in our reading of the facts, the arguments that are being used to inflame the minds of Churchmen against State intervention in spiritual concerns are as false as they are mischievous, and subversive of the religious welfare of the people of England.'

VIII.

When the policy of the Bishops is criticized, it must be remembered that it is not to the Episcopate as a body, but to the majority of the existing English Bench that the criticism applies. For, after all, there are such sees as Norwich, as Exeter, as

Worcester, as Birmingham and St. Edmundsbury: there are such Bishops as the venerable Bishop Knox, and the late Bishops Chavasse and Jayne. The Archbishop of Wales has spoken emphatically in the same sense; nor can we forget that our own Church was once the United Church of England and Ireland. Were it still so, we should not be, as we seem to be at present, rushing down the steep of Gadara into the sea. The Irish Primate, the Archbishop of Armagh, describes the situation in which we find ourselves in words which should be weighed by every thoughtful Englishman:

> 'The whole question of the relation between Church and State has been raised in a very acute form; and a tremendous danger looms ahead. The real question is, Are Church and State to be driven into opposition by rash and ill-advised action? The meaning of the Establishment of the Church of England is that it expresses the Christian faith of the Nation. It is the nation on its religious side. There is no sign that the people of Great Britain, whether in communion with the Church of England or not, desire its Disestablishment. On the contrary, recent events seem to prove that they mean to preserve the Church and to preserve it in such a way as may make it continue to be the true representative of the Faith of the Nation.
>
> The Prayer Book in its various forms, as it has come down to modern times, was the work of the Church accepted by the State; but never the work of the Church apart from the approval of the State. It was ever the work of the Church to initiate, and of the State to sanction, that which was presented; or to refuse sanction, if so determined. The recent votes in Parliament were therefore no departure from the great tradition of the centuries which have passed since the Reformation. I hold that our Ulster members of Parliament, as well as Scottish and Irish members, were not only within their legal rights, but were doing their duty in the highest sense of the word, when they voted on the Prayer Book Measure. Very earnestly we should hope and pray that no action may be taken by the leaders of the Church of England which would lead to that antagonism between Church and State which was for centuries the curse of Europe, and which even to-day injures the religious life of so many nations.' [7]

IX.

The history of the revision controversy is rather curious than edifying. Party feeling ran high; scruples wore thin. The officials lobbied; they pulled wires, often successfully; they went out into the highways and hedges, and a mixed bag rewarded their activity. They failed to secure Mr. Sakhlatvala,

[7] Synodal Address, 1928.

which seems to have rankled, from the irritation which his name excites in them; but they gained the valuable moral support of Lord Birkenhead—Mr. Chesterton's 'Chuck it, Smith!' and as the *New Statesman* unkindly reminded them, 'all the atheists voted on their side.'[8] They would have been better advised had they accepted the December vote of the House of Commons. From first to last they miscalculated. They took 'the busy party of "good Churchmen" for the Church; and the Church, in this sense of the word, for the Nation; they thought that, because they could impose silence on a too deferential clergy, they could also impose it on English Protestantism. They were mistaken. Here they were up against a much bigger thing. No one who was present at the Queen's Hall meeting on June 7th could doubt either its temper or its significance. It was not fashionable, or academic, or intellectual or ecclesiastically-minded. But one thought of Cromwell's Ironsides. I am not asking you to like these people; they would, I think, be indifferent either to your likes or your dislikes. But the Church Assembly and Convocation were simply not in it with them. They were 'as a drop in a bucket; as the small dust of the balance; as a very little thing.' The final vote of June 14th followed. What took place behind closed doors at Lambeth or in Downing Street must be matter of surmise. But the broad lines of the policy decided upon were presumably indicated by the ecclesiastical appointments made before the end of the session. Their significance was beyond question. To many it seems that those concerned shuffled the cards badly; and that when the defeated Bishops persuaded the Prime Minister to take their view of the situation, they did a bad day's work for the country, for the Church, and for themselves. It is possible that even now a frank statement of the facts might save the position. But it is improbable that it will be made. The Bishop of Worcester saw, he tells us, with surprise, the form in which the conclusions arrived at by the Bishops at their September meeting were made public. This form was such as to give the impression that they were arrived at unanimously. This, it appears, was not the case. Closed doors invite inconvenient questions. And the result of the recent synods show how divided the clergy are.

[8] December 24, 1927.

X.

We are, happily, not a logical people, and, logical as the Disestablishment of the Church may be, it will not take place unless the officialdom of the Church provokes it. The danger—and it is an imminent one—is that it may do so under a misconception, or rather a series of misconceptions, as to the facts. We have been told *e.g.* that 'no special sanctity attaches any longer to the religious verdicts of the sixteenth century'; that 'the Reformation is seen to be no more than a local episode in the history of Christ's religion'; and that 'at all hazards modern English Churchmen will be Catholic.'[9]

To most Englishmen such statements are alike amazing and incredible: they take one's breath away. Some half of our population belongs in a loose sense of the word to the Established Church, nine-tenths of them being Protestant; the Free Churches account for about as large a number; there is a considerable body of Roman Catholics, mostly of Irish origin; and a small number of nondescripts who stand outside the denominations. Where is 'the revolution of religious feeling' which leads modern Englishmen to resolve to be 'at all hazards Catholic?' Is it found outside the Anglo-Catholic Congresses and the English Church Union? and the readers of the *Church Times*?

If we are not to live in an unreal world, we must recognize—and the sooner we do the better—that the question so needlessly and so unwisely raised as to the Establishment of the National Church is not one that can be decided without the active good-will and co-operation of the Nonconformist Churches.

> 'I do not see (wrote Cardinal Newman in 1866) how it is possible to forget that the Established Church is the Church of *England*; that Dissenters are both in their own estimation and in that of its own members, in some sense a portion of it; and that, even were its whole proper laity Catholic in opinion, the whole population of England, of which Dissenters are nearly half, would, as represented by Parliament, claim it as their own. And, of course, when it came to the point, they would have fact and power on their side.'[10]

The first condition of the existence of the Church of England as by law established is that it shall remain national; and Protestant in the historical and actual sense of the word.

[9] *The Book and the Vote*, xxxvi.
[10] *Life of Cardinal Newman*, W. Ward, ii, 117.

A LAYMAN LOOKS AT THE CHURCH

By A. Wyatt Tilby, author of *The Evolution of Consciousness, The Quest of Reality,* etc.

IT is proverbially difficult for the layman to follow the workings of the clerical mind. That, no doubt, may be at once the layman's limitation and his loss. But as a piece of historical fact, there have also been times when the crude but direct attitude of the plain man takes a simple point that remains oddly obscure to the more subtle professional eye. The Inquisition, for example, deprived the heretic of his body for the good of his soul. The proposition, as stated by the best authorities, appears to be both logical and praiseworthy. But *autos-da-fé* have nevertheless ceased; not so much, apparently, from a lack of heretical or combustible material, but because lay opinion began to dislike the smell of burning.

Nobody, of course, would suggest for a moment that our own kindly spiritual pastors would contemplate, far less countenance, such ardent methods of propaganda. But to the politically-minded layman their actions and reactions over the Prayer Book controversy are exceedingly difficult either to fathom or to follow.

The case for the revision of a public manual three centuries old need not be argued again, particularly in these pages. But the historical antecedents of revision must be held to affect current ecclesiastical polity; and it is the fact that the first step towards revision was the appointment of a Royal Commission by Parliament in 1904 to investigate lawlessness in the Church of England. In its report two years later that Commission recommended the revision of the Prayer Book, the Convocations being advised to act in consultation with the laity; and when a decision was reached the consent of Parliament was to be obtained to give legal sanction to the proposed changes. This consent was necessary because the existing Prayer Book forms part of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, and can only be altered with the approval of Parliament.

The work of revision began. It was delayed by the war; and before the Revised Book was laid on the table of the House

the Enabling Act was passed (December 23, 1919), and, conformably to the above, it declared that 'A measure may relate to any matter concerning the Church of England, and may extend to the amendment or repeal in whole or in part of any Act of Parliament.' On a resolution being passed by each House of Parliament directing that such measure shall be presented to His Majesty, it shall be so presented, and shall have the force and effect of an Act of Parliament.

Under the Enabling Act, Parliament can debate but not amend a Measure laid before it by the Church Assembly; it must accept or reject *in toto*. Under that Act much beneficial legislation has been passed, but Parliament has on two or three occasions exercised its authority, and rejected Measures proposed for its approval.

That rejection has been received, with regret indeed, but without any suggestion of rebellion, by the Church Assembly; when the proposals with regard to the Shropshire Bishopric and the City Churches were refused, one by the House of Lords and the other by the House of Commons, there was no outcry that the hand of the State was too heavy to be borne; there was no suggestion that Members of Parliament did not understand the issues involved; and there was no attempt to enforce in a roundabout way what Parliament refused to countenance. The Church had made its bargain with the State, and on the whole was satisfied with it; on a calculation of loss and gain, the Enabling Act had quite definitely eased the process of ecclesiastical legislation.

Legally and constitutionally, the Prayer Book Measure was in precisely the same position as the Shropshire Bishopric; but since it involved matters of general and not merely local importance, it was certain to be more closely examined. Unfortunately for its supporters, their case was prejudiced in advance by a brawl in St. Paul's Cathedral, by bungling the prayer for the King, by omitting any prayer for the British Empire in the first edition, and by arguing below the level of their public form in the first debate. They prejudiced their case again in the second debate by suggesting in advance that Parliament was incompetent, and incapable of understanding the issues raised. A suitor is quite entitled to think the judge a

fool, but he does not, if he is wise, tell him so until he knows the verdict.

Actually Parliament appeared to understand the issue perfectly well. It was not, of course, competent to discuss the difficult questions of scholarship at issue between the Bishop of Gloucester and the Dean of Wells; nor did it concern itself with those points. It would not be competent to discuss some profound doctrine like the Trinity or the Incarnation; but these matters were not at issue. But Reservation is not a question of doctrine but of practice, and it does not really require a careful theological training to decide on such questions of practice. One may agree or disagree with the decision of the House of Commons to reject the procedure recommended in both the first and second Deposited Books; but the speeches made in both debates are sufficient refutation of the charge that the House failed to understand the issue.

The Book, then, was rejected; and many sermons were forthwith preached in which the House of Commons, I am afraid, got rather roughly handled. But the House had acted strictly in accordance with the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1904 and the Enabling Act. If the clergy had wanted it to act merely as a rubber-stamp, they should have prevailed upon some convenient Bishop in the House of Lords to introduce A Bill to Suspend the Veto of the House of Commons on Matters Relating to the Church of England. The result would have been interesting.

The double rejection of the Measure admittedly placed the Church in a very difficult position, and the ordinary man was interested to see how the ecclesiastical authorities would deal with it. The actual situation was to some extent conditioned by the fact that the demand for revision had come in the main from the clergy, while the laity on the whole were apathetic, or perhaps even inclined to raise the cry of Ancient Lights. In this the clergy were undoubtedly right and the laity undoubtedly wrong—some of us may even think that the clergy might have gone a good deal further than they did on the road of revision—but this contrast was a real factor in the position.

Several courses were in fact open, ranging from tame acceptance to stark defiance of the verdict of Parliament. The

former would have been awkward as well as undignified, for it had been declared in advance that the Revised Book was essential to the Church, and nobody really likes eating his words. The latter would have been courageous but critical: it must have entailed many resignations, probably some ejections, and almost certain Disestablishment and Disendowment in the near future. (The main drawback to Disestablishment as a political issue is the certainty that it will split the two major political parties.)

Acquiescence, of course, was safe; defiance dangerous, although perhaps not so dangerous as it looks. If half the Bishops had resigned their sees because they really meant what they said about the intolerable control of Parliament, England would certainly have sat up and begun to think more seriously about the Church than it has done for many a long day — and by England I mean not merely the small section of professional church-goers, but the vast majority of paganised Christians whose ultimate test of conscience is chucking one's job—a pretty high test, by the way. England may not always follow men who follow ideals, but at least it respects them.

In actual fact, not even a rural dean resigned, and the England that gets its religion from the Sunday papers came to the conclusion that the Church had taken it lying down. But that also was not quite true; something more astonishing was about to happen. Probably there was no perfect course; for the situation was already tangled by the fact that chaos had been prophesied if the Book was rejected, whereas actually things appeared to go on much as before. Some action, however, was necessary, and a compromise was determined on. But who could have foreseen that the worst of all possible compromises would be chosen?

The Bishops, after a period of mature deliberation, carefully refrained from criticizing Parliament. But the famous questionaire which was circulated to every parish did suggest that the greater part of the rejected Prayer Book might be introduced; in other words, that what had twice been declared illegal could nevertheless become legal; and that prayers and ceremonies which Parliament as a whole had refused to sanction could nevertheless be sanctioned by that small section of

Parliament which is known as the spiritual peerage. Unfortunately for this contention, the doctrine that the part is greater than the whole is not to be found in the English constitution.

It is doubtful if anything in recent years has done so much harm to the reputation of the Church as this attempt to get round the verdict of Parliament. At best it is an attempt to eat one's cake and have it too. At worst it appears to involve a breach of contract. When a Gas or Water Company promotes a Bill in Parliament, and that Bill happens to be rejected, the Company does not circularize its shareholders to know whether they are in favour of laying the pipes without authority, or whether they would prefer not to break the law. The Church is more than a public utility company, but it cannot afford to have a lower standard of ethics. The Church of England, in fact, is either Established or Disestablished; it cannot be half within and half without the law, like a man who does a reputable business at the front door and hobnobs with receivers at the back.

It will be answered that those who have adopted this course are honourable men, actuated by the best intentions. Of course they are. But the defence simply means that they have miscalculated the position all through. It is an admission that there is a great gulf fixed between the clergy and the laity.

In one sense, it is true, that is as it should be. The Church is in the world but not of the world; its problems are different, and its angles of approach must be different. But in another sense this cleavage, although inevitable, is extremely unfortunate.

The typical layman is occupied in earning his living; he has only time to keep one eye on politics, and perhaps half an eye on religion. If he is orthodox, his attitude to the parson is one of theoretical respect for the office combined with practical but kindly contempt for his lack of business equipment. If agnostic, the position is probably reversed, and his attitude is one of theoretical contempt for the office combined with kindly respect for the man—who, after all, does a number of odd jobs for the sick and the poor quite reasonably well. Religion may or may not be opium for the people, but on a rough balance the agnostic is inclined to think that the Church probably does rather more good than harm.

There is no anti-clericalism in this country; merely affectionate indifference, such as might exist between two brothers who seldom meet and have nothing in common. But the indifference is increasing and the affection diminishing.

It would be absurd to suggest that this is entirely the fault of the Church. The clergy are concerned with the grave issues of life and death and the deep problems which vex human thought, and it is not their fault that so many of the laity are Gallios. It is not that these people do not want to listen to what the parson has to say, but that they have no intention of listening to anything that anybody can conceivably have to say on these things. This sort of human material does not want to be converted, or even educated; it simply wants to be amused. But the Church is not really equipped to function as a successful music-hall or night-club.

Of late years, it is true, there has been a rather disproportionate increase in this frivolous attitude towards life, but it is important not to confuse the very different sources of the enlarging stream. In the first place, many people are making money fast who never made it before, and some of these cash their cheques rather quickly on rather obvious pleasures. These do not matter; even a Savonarola could not convert a new-rich road-hog.

The second category are more important. A large number of young folk, who are at bottom serious-minded, adopt a form of shallow cynicism not because they believe in it but because it is a convenient mask or protective mimicry. These people are really plastic under the skin, but it is tough work getting under the skin. They could be influenced, but are not likely to be, because they believe that the Church has nothing to offer them.

These shade off, by an imperceptible *anno domini* grading, into the third category, who feel rather vaguely that the old authorities have lost their strength.

It is probably not generally recognized by the clergy—who are naturally more in contact with church-goers than non-church-goers—how amazingly the situation has developed in the last few years. Perhaps it can be best expressed by saying that the Bible is no longer generally read. Macaulay once declared that

nobody was competent to express an opinion on English literature unless his mind was soaked in the Scriptures. Thirty years ago that statement would have been accepted without comment as a truism. To-day anything outside the most familiar quotation runs a risk of passing unrecognized, at least by the younger public. A politician, for instance, could safely venture an allusion to Daniel in the lion's den or the immortal Potiphar's wife at a mass meeting, but I doubt if the valley of dry bones would be generally identified. 'Unstable as water' would probably be regarded as an original phrase by the bulk of the audience; the better educated might possibly attribute it to Milton.

It is difficult to see how the clergy are to cope with a situation of this kind. Organisation is worse than useless; you cannot mechanize a spiritual army. Mere multiplication of services will do little for a generation which goes less to church, and which in any case has a daily wireless morning prayer broadcast into its own home if it wants it. The open church may do something; some people like to meditate in an empty church, but avoid regular services. Ritual, however exquisite and dignified, is only the shell; it will never satisfy those whose doubt is not of the symbol, but of the substance behind the symbol.

Ultimately, of course, the whole Christian philosophy will have to be thought out afresh, under the stimulus of discovery in new secular fields. This always appears alarming to the traditional type of mind, but after all this revision of ideas has been going on for nearly a century already.

To return to the point at which we started. The Church has its own internal difficulties, and these are grave enough to engage the best minds that it can recruit to its service. But while it is preoccupied with these matters, which are essentially problems of doctrine and thought, it does not appear wise to challenge the State (which is not unsympathetic), and Parliament (which has acted constitutionally according to the concordat of 1919). There may be disadvantages in Establishment, but they can hardly be intolerable, or they would not in fact have been tolerated nearly four centuries. And to turn from the necessary work of spiritual reconstruction to undertake an unnecessary political struggle seems, therefore, to an onlooker the very negation of sound ecclesiastical statecraft.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN AND THE FREE CHURCHMAN

By the Rev. Cyril H. Valentine, M.A., Ph.D.

THERE are some Free Churchmen to-day, perhaps not a few, who recognize a mental, moral, and spiritual affinity between themselves and Modern Churchmen. This is not true of Nonconformity as a whole; it is not true of any single denomination within Nonconformity: but in some denominations, and more especially amongst Congregationalists, there are to be met scholarly and devout ministers whose theological position is sufficiently near to the positions held by the Liberal Evangelicals and the Modernists within the Church of England to be entitled to the name Evangelical Modernism. Setting aside the important question whether the two parties within the Church of England might not, with advantage to both, unite upon a common ground of Evangelical Modernism, let us enquire whether in such a position there is possible a closer fellowship between Modernists and Nonconformists than has yet been experienced. It is sometimes found that thoughtful and studious ministers feel a strong desire to join the Anglican communion. What they read in the writings of several outstanding men in the Church of England convinces them that such a change of communion need not be accompanied by any radical change in their intellectual position. Even sacramental doctrine as re-interpreted by the Bishop of Birmingham is approved by their Nonconformist conscience. And since the Anglican has so much which they have not, they are allured by the idea of entering the Anglican Communion. But apart from the positive attraction which the Church of England has for many who are outside, there is also a growing conviction within the hearts of some of them that the need for the specific witness of the Free Churches is now either becoming possible within the Church of England or is becoming no longer necessary outside.

While, however, the occupation of common ground with many Anglicans attracts the Free Churchman into the Church

of England, there is no corresponding desire on the part of Modernists or Liberal Evangelicals to cross the boundary in the opposite direction. This is natural enough, since the gain is almost wholly on the one side. The mental and spiritual freedom which is the treasured possession of the Free Churchman is sometimes more in danger from the Trust Deeds of the older Nonconformist churches than ever it could be in the Established Church. And the protest against establishment is now heard as strongly from within the Church as from without.

There are, of course, some who, in changing their communion, go from one extreme to the other. These, however, are of an unstable type and tend to be governed more by imagination and sentiment than by moral and intellectual judgments. They are less dependable and less valuable within either communion than the more critical and conscientious members who could only change outwardly because such change would involve no fundamental change within. These men are repelled by the extreme positions in Anglicanism and Nonconformity alike, and sometimes wonder on which side of the narrow border they ought to stand. Yet their conscience can be quiet on either side, because most, if not all, of what to them matters most can be held on both sides. But the lot of the Anglican appears to be the more desirable largely owing to the enrichment of worship. The order and tradition of the English Church, the beauty and fitness of its buildings, the status of its ministry, and the greater opportunity it affords for influence and service are also considerations which weigh heavily in favour of the English Church. And yet, despite all this, the number of those who transfer their allegiance from Nonconformity to Modernism or Liberal Evangelicalism must be small, considerably smaller than the number of those who change to join an extreme party. It may be worth glancing at some of the reasons why, when the need for clergy is so great, so few of those Nonconformists who are Evangelical Modernists do, in point of fact, enter the Church of England.

The difficulty on the score of finance may suggest itself first of all. But in most cases this is probably not the greatest obstacle. Nevertheless, it must be counted as one of the difficulties. A married man may be unable to accept as a curate about half what he has received as a Free Church minister. The

necessity for re-ordination, both as deacon and priest, presents another difficulty. But again this is probably for most not the chief hindrance. Without denying the validity of a former ordination, a man may regard re-ordination as the giving of a fuller commission and wider authority. Or he may look upon it as a submission to the present order because the time is not yet ripe for the recognition of non-episcopal ordination as sufficient, or as needing only to be regularized by episcopal sanction. These two difficulties mentioned are perhaps less formidable than two others which have to be faced. It is a disheartening prospect for a man who has had full responsibility as sole minister of a Nonconformist church to be compelled to serve in some junior position, doing the work normally expected from a man considerably younger and less experienced. His lot may become almost intolerably irksome unless he is permitted to serve *with* rather than *under* an incumbent, and with a man, too, who can show sympathetic understanding and at the same time offer him a congenial sphere for his labours. Such incumbents are, of course, to be found. But unless the minister in a Free Church can be sure that he will be able to join such a man, the fear of being compelled to accept a title from a very different type of man is likely to act as a real deterrent. The greatest obstacle of all, however, has yet to be mentioned. Not only is it required of a Free Churchman that he should begin his service in the Church of England in a position normally held by a man of about twenty-five years of age; such a position he might be prepared to accept for a time: it is further required that before he reaches even this position he must submit to a period of training in a Theological College. Now, it may be right and necessary that before beginning service within the Anglican Church a man coming from a Nonconformist Church should be required to study the Prayer Book, both liturgically and doctrinally, and also the history of the Church of England. And it is probably wise that he should be given an opportunity to imbibe the peculiar spirit of worship and devotion which is to be found within the Church he comes to serve. These needs, however, could be better met by close association for a time with some cathedral. In that atmosphere, attending the daily offices and receiving the sacrament, he could also read under the guid-

ance of the Canons, whose scholarship he would respect and whose friendship would be of inestimable value to him. In such society, rather than in a Theological College amongst students so much younger than himself, would he most fitly receive what he himself would be the first to recognize that he needed, the initiation into the mind and spirit of the English Church. This suggestion assumes, of course, that the Canons of a cathedral would be willing and able to play such a part towards the newcomer. But such an assumption ought to be justified in all cases, and doubtless would in most. It would be a further act of considerateness (and such a concession would meet the previous difficulty noticed) if, after a sufficient interval of time, the minister could be ordained to a title given by this cathedral itself. His diaconate could then be served, assisting at the services of the cathedral and also helping at neighbouring churches. After six months' diaconate he could be ordained priest, and could thus go to his first curacy as a colleague in priest's orders. By this time, too, probably a suitable sphere of work would have been found. This method of transition from one ministry to another would mean at most an interval of a year between relinquishing service as a Free Church minister and taking up new service as a priest in the Church of England.

In sending a Free Church minister back to college again, not only is he being subjected to unnecessary humiliation, but the Church is losing more than a year of his full service. And moreover, as already said, the end in view is better served by the other method. The training for the ministry of the Free Church is, in almost all cases, much more thorough and satisfactory than that given in the Theological Colleges of the Church of England. Some Nonconformist colleges impose a course of from five to seven years, and usually a three or four years' course in Divinity is regarded as a minimum. The standard of training is determined by the requirements of the London University for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity (or by some corresponding degree in another University), and obviously such a test is more exacting than the General Ordination Examination. In addition to this scholarly grounding in Divinity, the student for the Nonconformist ministry has also received what the candidate for Holy Orders often lacks, both training

and experience in the art of sermon preparation and delivery, and also (an important matter) in the public reading of the Scriptures. To demand that a man who, in addition to this training, has received non-episcopal ordination and has subsequently served for some few years in a pastorate, should be sent to a Theological College (and moreover to a college where the requirements are lower than in a Nonconformist college) is surely making the way needlessly hard. Even if no other course were open, such a situation ought to suggest the need for some other way. But in point of fact, with a very little adjustment, a more excellent way can easily be made available.

It is small wonder that, with such difficulties to be faced, only a very few amongst those Nonconformists who have leanings to the Church of England actually find their way in. The very fact that morally and intellectually they can be loyal to truth in either camp makes them unwilling to pay so great a price for what, nevertheless, seems to them to be no small gain. It is disappointing, too, when one is approached by a Free Church minister, to have to give such an answer that he must needs turn away sorrowful, not because he has great possessions, but because he lacks wherewithal to pay so great a price.

Assuming, however, that such impediments as those already mentioned have either been removed or rendered not insurmountable, can the Modernist or Liberal Evangelical meet with cordiality and confidence any advances that may be made by ministers from the Free Churches? Other parties within the Church would only tolerate a change of communion if it were accompanied by a radical change in belief concerning the nature of the Church and ministry. But need the Modernist school in the Church demand a drastic revolution in faith from those who wish to transfer their allegiance from the liberal party in Nonconformity? The theological position of many Modernists closely resembles that of many Free Churchmen, and consequently, if the Free Churchman can feel at home in the Church of England, ought he not to be given a welcome? In order to arrive at an answer to this question, let us enquire what are likely to be some of the views of a Free Churchman seeking to enter the Church of England as an Evangelical Modernist.

The crucial test will be applied if we ask what are the views

held on the nature of the Church, Ministry, and Sacraments.[1] The principles here to be stated are held by several Congregationalists, and by some of the more advanced thinkers in other denominations. With regard to the Church, it would be maintained that the one indispensable condition of membership must be personal faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and acceptance of Him as Lord of life and conduct. Failure to continue in this faith would mean forfeiture of membership pending readmission on the same conditions as at first, together with sufficient evidence of repentance and reformation. Such loss of faith would be evident in prolonged continuous absence from the Lord's Supper or in grossly unrighteous behaviour. Dishonest bankruptcy, drunkenness, gambling, and similar offences would disqualify a man from membership no less than flagrant immorality. Hence, there would be an expectancy that loyalty to Christ would be expressed in the moral life rather than in the recitation of a creed. Credal formularies are not, for the most part, allowed to determine admission either to the Church or the Ministry. In some cases, however (and not only in Presbyterian Churches), the Westminster Confession is taken as a test of orthodoxy. But the general tendency in Congregationalism is to insist that personal faith in Christ is sufficient. Such faith often enough can recite the Nicene Creed. What is made central, however, is not the creed but the Christ. The function of the creed seems to be the exclusion of error rather than the safeguarding of truth. Truth needs no credentials. And it seems to be an abuse of the creed when it is allowed to repulse those who are attracted by the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. Personal allegiance to Christ is more important than the absence of all doubt and difficulty in accepting as equally evident each and every clause in the creed. Belief in Christ's Divinity is more essential than belief in the Virgin Birth; and the belief in Christ's continued presence in the hearts of those that love Him is more vital to the Christian life than belief in the wholly physical nature of the Resurrection and Ascension. In a word, the creed should not be allowed to excommunicate the soul that whispers, 'Lord, I believe; help Thou my unbelief.'

[1] *Cf.* Dale, *The Principles of Congregationalism*: Forsyth, *The Church, Ministry, and Sacraments.*

The Church is constituted by the presence of Christ in the midst of two or three gathered together in His Name. *Ubi Christus ibi ecclesia.* The guidance of the Spirit within the Church is believed to be so real that the Church meeting, in reaching some decision after prayer and conference, is able to say, 'It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us.' The visible manifestation of the Church in the world is the assembling together of those who love and desire to serve the Lord Jesus Christ. The real Church is the invisible, spiritual Church; but the reality of the local Church as a part of this great Church is peculiarly experienced in the Lord's Supper.

The ministry of the Church is a representative priesthood. It is representative alike of God to the people and of the people before God. The minister, accordingly, is both called of God and chosen by the congregation which he is to serve. In prayer, he is the voice expressing the people's need before the throne of Grace; in preaching, he is the prophet revealing the nature of God and declaring His Will for the people. It is thus a priestly office, but the priesthood is representative and in no sense sacerdotal. The consistency of the Free Churches in disclaiming and refusing every trace of sacerdotalism issues from a burning conviction of conscience. The Congregational minister, for instance, will not pronounce absolution or benediction, except by ranking himself alongside with those who receive the forgiveness or blessing. The whole work of the ministry is accomplished by moral and spiritual means, and any means which suggest magic or priestly powers are carefully avoided.

The two sacraments generally necessary to salvation are alike believed in and administered. Baptism, however, is dissociated from any doctrine of regeneration, and is often regarded in the light of a dedication service. Holy Communion is celebrated, not with set forms of prayer, but always with prayer and with the use of the words of institution. The doctrine attaching to the service is more than Zwinglianism, and is perhaps best interpreted as essentially Receptionist. It is very much the position reached in the Prayer Book of 1552. The gift believed to be conveyed in Holy Communion is the gift of Grace. And, rejecting Newman's verse as Romanist, the Free Churchman affirms that there can be no higher gift than Grace. As a means

of grace, however, the sacraments are secondary in importance and depend upon and gain their meaning from the preaching of the Gospel of Grace. The declaration of St. Paul that he was sent not to baptize, but to preach the gospel, is regarded as giving the right place to preaching and sacraments. The great apostle also did not say, and could not have said, 'Woe is me if I do not administer the Sacraments.' The spiritual constraint put upon a man is to preach the gospel.[2] Indeed, the Free Churchman regards the preaching of the gospel as itself a sacramental act. Preaching is an effective means of grace, as true a means as the sacrament and effective in conveying the same grace. And without the continuous preparation of heart and conscience through evangelical preaching, there can hardly be possible a right reception of the sacrament when administered. Some Congregationalists there are who believe that sacramental preaching is a more moral and spiritual means of grace than the actual breaking of bread. In holding such beliefs they would claim to have the mind of the Fourth Evangelist. The sixth chapter of *St. John* appears to proclaim the reality of a spiritual communion.[3] And if it is possible to make a spiritual communion, it must be unnecessary to make use of the elements for private or sick communions. The right use of the elements is in the corporate communion in church, where, by means of individual cups, they can be consumed by the minister and all the people simultaneously. A right teaching on the possibility and reality of spiritual communion seems to be the true corrective to the demand for reservation.

Is there a place in the English Church for those who hold such beliefs? If such beliefs are inadequate, what is it necessary to add in order to justify admission into the Anglican Communion? Ought the advances of Free Churchmen to be met with encouragement, the lightest burdens only being added and the way made as easy as possible—or ought a great change and sacrifice to be required? Should the aim be to include within the Church all who will be loyal servants of Christ as the Head of the Church—or is it better to maintain a more definite

[2] It is noteworthy that in the Ordination Service the commission given by the Bishop mentions the Word before the Sacraments: 'Be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy Sacraments.'

[3] *Cf.* Westcott, *The Gospel of St. John*, in loco.

and less comprehensive Church and by so doing to perpetuate schism? Once more, is it better that those Free Churchmen who are drawn to the Church of England, and who feel that there is room and homeliness for such as they within no less than outside its fold, should remain outside and work towards reunion—or that they should be invited to enter as if they were sons returning home after a long journey? Finally, would an accession of the spirit of the Reformation as seen in the Free Churches, or an affinity with the mediaevalism of the Roman Church, aid more the Church of England in realizing its own true end?

THE PROBLEM OF ANGLICAN UNITY

IN the midst of controversy it is difficult to maintain a proper balance of ideas, viewing the disputes in the clear light of fundamental logic: yet, though difficult, it is a process which would clear away many needless antagonisms. In these critical times of the Anglican Church it is eminently useful to have recourse to that process. How reconcile 'partisanship' with mutual toleration?

What is partisanship? The English Church — especially since the Reformation — has comprised widely differing schools of thought. After the schisms of the sixteenth century in the Western Church, the effort was made in England to comprehend the maximum number of Englishmen in a national Church which should be Catholic as well as Reformed. The problem, however, bristled with difficulties. There were men of a Calvinist type of thought; Erastians who believed that kings had divine rights as well as priests and popes; Catholics strongly attached to the old ways, and desirous of maintaining as many elements of the mediaeval traditions and practices as they could; and there were money-loving, power-pursuing opportunists, and men of political rather than religious outlook. All these contributed to the compromises and conflicts of the Reformation period. The consequences of that fact have come down to us and lie at the root of many of our present problems.

A key to the right understanding of these problems is to be found in a realization — not merely in theory, but carried into

practical effect in the relationship of various schools of thought to one another — that the present English Church is in continuity with the Church of the ages, besides being a Reformed Church; and, conversely, that it is a Reformed Church as well as being in continuity with the Church of the ages. Nor can it be said that these words are a mere statement of commonplaces. On the contrary, though both those facts, as to the English Church, are acknowledged in theory, half our troubles arise from ignoring or undervaluing one or the other of them in practice.

Consider, first, that aspect of the English Church which is found in its historic continuity. That is the aspect which is too often neglected by extreme partisans of the Protestant school. While that school would not *deny* (indeed, it would vindicate) the continuity of the English Church, its tendency is to some extent to overlook some of the 'practical implications' of that continuity. Those implications, however, have a very definite meaning. Has the ancient, pre-Reformation history of the English Church no significance for us — or a significance as to which we are to consider only the *evils* which existed in those time? The very suggestion needs only to be stated in order to be rejected as ridiculous. The Church of Bede, of Alcuin, of Lanfranc, of St. Thomas of Canterbury, of Pecock, of Chicheley; the Church of our fathers who reared innumerable shrines of piety, and whose devotion framed the formularies from which are derived so many of the very prayers which are so precious to us; our continuity with the Church of those ages is a fact not to be ignored or undervalued, but to be regarded as a vital factor in framing our view of Church problems of the present time. In those ages, however, the English Church was in visible communion with the whole Western Church. Therefore, if the historic continuity of the English Church has any practical significance for us, it must be that of causing us to take a Catholic view of things: a view which avoids merely insular standpoints and takes into its purview Christendom as a whole, valuing all the treasures of ancient piety and historic culture, and viewing the existing schisms in Christendom not as things over which to rejoice, but as defects to be remedied.

However, if the Catholic point of view be held to the exclusion — or to the neglect — of the realization of the significance

of the further fact that the English Church is Reformed, then a fallacy is perpetrated as grievous as, though in the opposite direction from, that which exists if the Reformed characteristics of the Church be insisted on to the neglect of its Catholic continuity. Each of the factors has its part to play. The words of the celebrated 1900 Visitation Charge of Bishop Stubbs recur to the mind, that the Reformed character of the English Church 'is the complement of its Catholic history.'

To outsiders, the 'parties' in the English Church are a constant source of criticism and even of ridicule. The Church of England, they say, is chaotic. By controversialists of the Roman Catholic Church, for example, it is contrasted with the firm unity of their own communion.

The effectiveness of such an argument in a rhetorical sense, however, is greater than its expression of the truth of things. A Church must be looked at with an eye not to one period only, but to its whole history. No conflicts in the English Church equal — or have equalled — those of the Great Schism of the West in the Latin Church. Assuming, however, that the Latin Church's unity is, and always has been, as firm as it is depicted in controversial writings, yet it is still a question whether autocracy does not present difficulties as great as those of liberty. Autocracy tends to overrate its own powers, and constantly to aim at their increase at the expense of the rights of those of others. It tends to stereotype abuses. It comes into conflict with history and truth. It seems a simple, ready solution of doubts: but simple, ready solutions are not necessarily true ones. Thus, though the Anglican position does not present that impressive outward unity which appears in the present Latin communion, it does not follow that the Anglican position is wrong.

'Parties' may be healthy expressions of the effort to develop truth in spiritual liberty. The Catholic party is especially devoted to the English Church's ancient continuity and kinship to the rest of Christendom. The Evangelical party emphasizes the benefits of the Reformation. The Modernist party aims to reconcile religious faith with truth as made known in modern science and historical research. Each tendency is necessary: but none can be exclusive.

What, then, is the best way of seeking a definite practical solution of the problem of these seemingly radical diversities? And, also, what are we to think of the present attitude of the Anglo-Catholic party and its apparent determination not to tolerate the Modernist movement?

The writer of this article is expressing his own personal views, binding no one else. In such delicate problems, what more can any single writer do? I recognize, then, to the full the legitimate position of the Anglo-Catholic party in the Church of England, as expressing (so far as it keeps within reasonable limits) a necessary aspect of historic Christianity; but I think that party is unwise and wrong in so far as it takes up an intolerant attitude to others. Had the intolerant spirit prevailed in the past, the Anglo-Catholic movement itself would have been driven from the Church of England. At its beginning it was certainly not regarded, either by the generality of the people or by the rulers of the Church, as 'a legitimate point of view.' Newman, in his *Apologia*, records the effect of 'the persevering attack of the bishops on Tract 90': 'a series of their *ex cathedrâ* judgments, lasting through three years,' and how what he took to be 'such an unanimous expression of opinion from the bishops, supported, as it has been, by the concurrence, or at least silence, of all classes in the Church, both lay and clerical,' led him to think 'the English Church is showing herself intrinsically alien from Catholic principles.' In short, Anglo-Catholicism was regarded as an illegitimate view, and its existence now is due to the failure of the policy of intolerance. How, then, can Anglo Catholics invoke that policy themselves: either as morally right or as wise? Moreover, by what rules is it to be judged (and by whom) as to who shall be refused tolerance? To go outside the borders of the Anglican Church, and consider other branches of the Church Catholic, it is but a few months since, in the encyclical *Mortalium Animos*, the present Pope, Pius XI, declared that belief in 'the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, in the sense defined by the Vatican Council,' is as necessary as is belief in 'the mystery of the Holy Trinity.' If we restrict ourselves to the Anglican Church, we find that the Evangelical party is as confident in asserting that Anglo-Catholics are disloyal as the latter are that

the Modernists are. Who is to be the 'excommunicating judge'? Indeed, I feel sure of this: whether directed against a party, or against any particular person, intolerance and boycotting react rather against those so acting than on the boycotted.

I have sympathy with Anglo-Catholicism in its effort to cultivate genuinely Catholic aspects of religion; but genuinely *Catholic* cannot mean definitely *narrow*. Catholic and *narrow* are contradictories. When a member of the *Roman* communion I saw enough of narrowness to convince me that that spirit is fatal to the best development of truth; and it would be equally so in the Anglican communion.

There can be no doubt whatever that many developments of Anglo-Catholicism are hard to reconcile with loyalty to the English Church. For example, if anything is clear it is that that Church, at the Reformation, deliberately discarded the mediaeval theory of the Mass, both in regard to the Sacrifice and to Transubstantiation. I must be scrupulously clear as to what I mean by that assertion. I mean that the mediaeval theory was (as it still is in the Roman Catholic Church) that 'the Divine Victim who shed His blood for us on the cross applies to us the merits of His passion, by offering Himself continually on the altar'[1]; and that 'the entire Christ is contained in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, under each species, and under every part of each species when they are separated.'[2] This was certainly the teaching which was *deliberately discarded* by the English Church at the Reformation; it was the teaching that was understood by the use of the word Mass; and for that very reason the word, Mass, also was discarded as the official designation of the service. Why, then, are strong parties of Anglo-Catholics so zealous to reintroduce the word Mass, and ceremonies and teachings approximating in the greatest possible degree to the mediaeval doctrine? For example, in a booklet entitled *Bringing Back the Mass*, issued by the Catholic Literature Association, I read (p. 2):

> 'Now when it is said that we are trying to bring back the Mass, what is meant, of course, is that the Mass is a Roman Catholic substitute for the Lord's Supper, and that the Church of England got rid of it at the Reformation. Our claim is that the Church of England did

[1] See Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, ed. 1917, p. 331.
[2] Council of Trent; Session 13, Canon 3.

nothing of the kind, and that the Lord's Supper and the Mass are only two different names for the same thing. Indeed, were there space in this tract, it would be most easy to show in detail that the Communion Service in the Book of Common Prayer, though it has many faults and blemishes and is much in need of revision, is the same in all important points as the Mass of pre-Reformation times.'

Now I cannot understand this at all. Does it mean that it is not an 'important point' whether or not the Eucharist is actually the same Sacrifice as was offered on the Cross, and whether or not the consecrated elements are actually the 'entire Christ'? To say that this is not an 'important point,' would be absurd. If, however, it *is* important, then the booklet must mean that the teaching of the English Church on this subject should be the same as that of the unreformed Church. That, however, would be to deny the whole history of the English Church's doctrinal standards for over three hundred and fifty years. It could not be reconciled with loyalty to the English Church. Roman Catholics should surely be good judges of their own doctrine, and of the relation of other doctrines to it; and there is no doubt as to what is their position in regard to this matter. Mr. Herbert E. Hall, for instance, in his Catholic Truth Society booklet, *Have Anglicans any Right to call themselves Catholics?* says (pp. 14-15):

'A new Ordinal was drawn up and used (by the Reformers), which, owing to its defective form and intention (which was to ordain a non-sacrificing ministry in place of the Catholic sacrificing priesthood) was invalid, and caused the Church of England, already in schism and heresy, to incur the further disaster of losing the Apostolic Succession. Edward's Ordinal and Communion Service must be judged by their contents, by the studied omission, in every place where they had occurred, of words and terms which signified the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and by the known and expressed views of those who compiled them and of those who restored them in the time of Elizabeth. Modern High Church Anglicans read into them their own present ideas derived from the Catholic Church, and persuade themselves, and try to persuade others, that those were the ideas and the intentions of those who compiled them. *If* [italics in original] *they were, there would have been no need for a new Ordinal or for a new Communion Service at all.* If the old doctrines were retained, the old Service Books, hallowed by long use in the Catholic Church and by the employment of them by countless generations of Saints and holy men all the world over, would have sufficed. But it was the Mass which mattered; and next to the Papacy, it was the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, whereby Christ is offered for the living and the dead, of which the Reformers, both in Edward's reign and in Elizabeth's, were most determined to be rid, and which in consequence they rigorously excluded from the new Service Books, and in other ways condemned.'

As to this argument of Mr. Hall's I would make these remarks: Mr. Hall (quite naturally, as a Roman Catholic) assumes that the mediaeval Roman doctrines, as to the Papal Supremacy, the Sacrifice of the Mass, 'intention,' and Transubstantiation, are essentials of Christianity, and therefore that the discarding of them destroys a Church and its Sacraments. Herein he begs the very question at issue. Believers in Reformed Christianity would say those doctrines were mediaeval developments, and that purer Christianity exists without them. However, the point of present interest is that the English Church, at the Reformation, discarded the mediaeval theory of the Mass as certainly as it discarded the mediaeval theory of the Papacy; and a school which overlooks the former fact is as alien to the Anglican standards as is a school which would overlook the other. In a Catholic Literature Association booklet, *The Marks of the Church*, it is said, quite accurately (p. 7), that 'at the Reformation . . . the Catholic Church in England rejected the unhistorical and autocratic claims of the Pope.' True! — but no less it rejected the mediaeval doctrine of the Mass.

I conclude, then, that the Catholic conception of the English Church must be reconcilable with the reformed and progressive character of that Church. That being so, it must not mistake mediaevalism for Catholicism.

From that point of view, I for one should cordially endorse the aims of any organization in the English Church having for its objects 'mutual assistance in the work of Christ's Church . . . more especially the popularization of the Catholic Faith,' but I should understand 'the Catholic Faith' in no narrow sense. Take the matter of Councils. I should distinguish between those (especially that of Nicaea, 325) held when East and West were united, and those (such as the Fourth Lateran and Trent) held after the division of East from West. I should respect the former as ecumenical; but not the latter. In regard to *all* Councils, however, I should view them as subject to interpretation in the light of the progressive knowledge of the ages. The traditional faith of Christndom conveys to us a Divine message; but that Divine message is conveyed to minds which express it in human language. The task of progressive Christianity, then, is to be reverent towards the past, but to have a

mind open to new knowledge. Catholic, Protestant, and Modernist: each school has its work to do, but none should ignore or contemn the legitimate tasks of the others. To reconcile these tendencies is no light task. Indeed, in this imperfect world, perfect agreement may not be possible; but the effort should be to bring out the maximum expression of truth by patient and reverent study. The identification of orthodox Christianity with old-fashioned and out-of-date views is causing thousands of people to discard religion altogether; if that process is not to get worse and worse, is it not necessary to show that orthodox Christianity need not be identified with old-fashioned and out-of-date views?

J. W. Poynter.

THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH

I.—HISTORICAL.

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick.

IT is commonly known that the constitution of the Church of England is highly peculiar, and is the result of certain historical circumstances. The mediaeval Church in England was organized as a purely clerical body, and was far more independent of the State than the Roman Church in any country is to-day, when States have become so much stronger and better organized than they were in the Middle Ages. The clergy had their own courts of justice and voted their own taxes. Abbeys and monasteries were autonomous corporations, independent often of episcopal control. The chief hold which the secular English State had over the Church, which was an international organisation, was the appointment of bishops by the Crown. Such was the compromise which had been reached between the English kings and the papacy. Bishops, though nominally elected by the chapters of their cathedral bodies, were, in practice, appointed by the Pope on the nomination of the Crown. Thus the bishops, who in most matters ruled the Church, though subject in matters spiritual to the Pope, were the nominees of the Crown. This was the only measure of lay control of Church and clergy known to pre-Reformation England. The king filled

the bench; and though the men whom he put in were technically the Pope's servants, they were generally loyal king's men, and in practice often civil servants of tried efficiency. Thus some Church revenues were made to serve national purposes.

The object of Henry VIII's changes was to substitute national for papal control of the Church in England. The problem presented by the religious houses was solved by suppressing them, nor were the secular clergy sorry to see their rivals go. A strong body of lay support for the ecclesiastical revolution was ensured by the distribution of abbey lands. The body of the clergy, who grudged the tolls laid upon them by the Pope, in Convocation were prevailed upon to acknowledge the king as 'Supreme Head of the Church of England, so far as the law of Christ allows,' the saving clause being expunged three years later. Thus without bloodshed and with a minimum of controversy the Church in England was nationalized.

With regard to the Elizabethan settlement, rendered necessary by the Marian unsettlement, it is highly interesting to follow Mr. G. M. Trevelyan's comparison of this with contemporary ecclesiastical arrangements in Scotland.[1] In both countries it was desired to establish lay control of the Church, but this was secured by entirely different methods. In Scotland the reformers insisted upon lay representation on the ecclesiastical assemblies, and also associated the parochial clergyman with a board of lay elders. The Scottish system of Church government was one of lay control *from inside*. But in England the laity were given no representation on Church assemblies, and the parish clergyman was left in possession of his old independence. It is true that the churchwardens could report or 'present' him before the proper civil authority if he did not keep faithfully to the Book of Common Prayer, just as they could 'present' their fellow-parishioners who did not come to church. But so long as the parson kept the law of the realm he was a free man, and not (like his Scottish brother) badgered by local lay control. His sole master was the bishop and the law which governed both. Thus in England lay control was exercised *from outside*, and as it were from the top down. The instrument of this control was not the parochial deacon, the local pietist or busybody,

[1] *History of England*, Book III, Chapter v.

but the sovereign on his throne. At this stage, while the Tudor régime lasted, it was indeed the Crown rather than Parliament which was ecclesiastically supreme in England.

This supremacy of the Crown rather than of Parliament survived into the Stuart epoch, but Charles I, in collaboration with Laud, used it to antagonize Englishmen, and at the Restoration it was Parliament rather than the Crown that became supreme. It is worth notice that the Commonwealth, which was the result of Laudian fussiness and intransigence, gave Englishmen a taste of what complete inside lay control of religion is like. It meant then, as it always has meant and will mean, that fanatics are at liberty to make life intolerable for quiet people. The rule of the Saints was too much on the Scottish model to commend itself to Englishmen. Hence the Restoration with its savage hostility to sectaries, and its relentless persecution of the saintly Baxter. The age had had enough of religious enthusiasm and only asked to be let alone—a mood which lasted for a century.

The foregoing historical survey would seem to indicate that the characteristic features of the constitution of the Church of England are two. In the first place it is a national institution governed by the civil power. This means, theoretically, some degree of subjugation, but practically, complete freedom. So long as it gives the government no trouble, the Church will be let alone. In fact it was let alone from 1662 until the Reform Bill, and thereafter until our own day, when State interference was asked for. The second point is that the English parochial clergyman has been in the highly enviable position of being free from lay control. Nor is he subjected to any serious degree of ecclesiastical control either, since even bishops hesitate to touch a person so fortified by legal privilege. He has been more free of his people than his Nonconformist brother, and more free of his bishop than his Roman colleague. And the fact that his income has been derived from endowments has strengthened his position still further.

Another fruit of the perhaps anomalous constitution of the Church of England has been that, owing to lay control, doctrinal discipline has been somewhat difficult to enforce. And this has been due to the particular character of the lay control exercised. Had lay control of the clergy taken the shape of that

customary among Nonconformist bodies, clergy of doubtful orthodoxy could have been dealt with by a regular system of delation and suppression. But as things have been, a lay control vested in Parliament has been singularly self-effacing. The supreme legislative assembly of the nation has had little time for heresy hunts, even if it had the taste for them. And when its lay courts have been called on to pronounce judgment, they have erred (if they can be said to have erred) on the side of liberality and doctrinal latitudinarianism. Thus, it is not only that the Church has been spared the entrusting of its doctrinal standards to the always prejudiced and narrow judgment of ecclesiastical assemblies, which always give a heretic short shrift. The Church has also been fortunate in having its lay control rightly vested, so that the power has not been in the hands of the local busybody, but in the hands of the highest legal and administrative authority.

Another heritage of incalculable value to the Church of England has been the preservation of the mediaeval method of appointing bishops. The prime minister acting for the Crown may be relied on to make a more judicious selection than a synod of clergy. It is a matter of considerable importance that the officials who govern the Church should not be the nominees of the rank and file, whose prejudices, in that case, they would have to reflect, and in case of need, to enforce upon everyone.

A further piece of good fortune for the Church of England has been its intimate connection with the two older Universities —a link which is a survival of mediaeval custom. It has been held by some that the unduly ecclesiastical atmosphere of Oxford (which has been termed 'the Rome of Anglicanism') must prove inimical to sound learning. But though the Church may be a handicap to the University, the proposition is not reversible, and the University has been a distinct advantage to the Church by keeping it in touch with contemporary culture. It is owing to this association of Church and University, dating from the Middle Ages, that there is not the wide gulf fixed in England between the academic world and the pulpit which exists, we are told, in most other countries. This helps to preserve in the Church of England some of that Renaissance tradition which was personified, in the Tudor period which gave it birth, in such

men as Erasmus, Colet, and More, and, a little later, in Richard Hooker, and subsequently in the Cambridge Platonists. An *entente* between contemporary culture and religion is not a thing to be despised, and it has the most wholesome effect upon both religion and learning. The Church of England, owing to its anomalous constitution (due, as we have seen, to historical circumstances), has hitherto provided the English people with an organ or instrument of such an *entente*. In this we have, hitherto, been a very much favoured nation.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE AGAPE: A FALSE SCENT

MYSTERIUM UND AGAPE: DIE GEMEINSAMEN MAHLZEITEN IN DER ALTEN KIRCHE. By Karl Völker. (L. Koltz, Gotha; 1927.)

There is a great need for a trustworthy monograph on the Agapè. It was therefore with disappointment that we read this latest book on the subject. Dr. Völker unfortunately has a new theory to add to the confusion which the scholarship of the last twenty years has been laboriously clearing away. It is that the Agapè was not an early institution, but was invented late in the second century as a kind of counterblast to Gnosticism. In order to maintain this somewhat fantastic thesis Dr. Völker has to return to the old belief that the Last Supper was a Passover meal; and he does not seem to us to do more by way of proof than repeat the old points and endeavour to extract a new meaning from them. What is more serious is that he has not read the latest books on the subject (except Lietzmann), or perhaps we should say that, commendably full as he is in his references, he quotes no English writer (so far as we have noticed) later than Keating, who was already behind the times when his book was published early in the century. He is confused about the chronology of the Hippolytean documents, because apparently he has not seen Connolly's volume on the subject in the Cambridge University Press' *Texts and Studies* (Vol. VIII, No. 4, 1916)—a volume which has secured a general acceptance among scholars. Worst of all, perhaps, considering that the affiliation to Judaism is fatal to his argument, he has clearly not read Dr. Oesterley's *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1925).

He seems to have got his extracts about the hour of the Eucharist from some collection of 'proof-texts'; for he quotes the well-known extract from Augustine's letter to Januarius without apparently having discovered in a later part of the letter Augustine's advice to communicate after the usual refection at three o'clock; and on p. 190 he quotes, surely from a similar collection, the passage forged in the name of Chrysostom, which was exposed by the Bollandist, Stilting, in 1753, with the approval of Pope Benedict XIV (the evidence is transcribed in J. Wickham Legg's *Papal Faculties*, 1905, p. 41). Nor can we feel great confidence in his reasoning. He thinks, for instance, that the Greek-speaking Bithynians in Pliny's rescript might have used the word *sacramentum, i.e.* an oath, in the sense that was just growing up in ecclesiastical Latin a hundred years

later; and, although he avoids the blunder of taking this to mean that the Christians on the Black Sea came to an early Communion (rightly saying that the 'innocent meal' later in the day must be the Communion, if anything is), he suggests the almost equally impossible idea that it may refer to Baptism. As Dr. Völker's hypothesis will not allow an agapè at this period, he is obliged to say that the well-known passage in the Didachè about 'being filled' after the meal must be taken in a non-natural sense as meaning that the recipients were 'filled' after communion. We are sorry not to be able to speak more highly about an able and painstaking book: but we feel our readers deserve to be warned against a thesis which might keep our knowledge back for a generation about a subject of real practical importance. There is no index.

A SPIRIT RELIGIOUS.*

Amid the clamorous demands for intellectual restatement and ecclesiastical reform, we are apt to forget the primary importance of religious experience. Here is an account of it in the life of a 'young man of the twentieth century.' In giving us the story of his religious life, Dr. Raven has defied both the prejudices of some Church people and the scepticism of the secular world. *A Wanderer's Way* makes a significant variation in modern religious literature and is an extremely interesting and moving story. It is the work of a spirit deeply religious.

Canon Raven selects for mention those incidents, great or small in themselves, which seem to him to have influenced his life. With this principle he describes his home in London, and the schooldays when 'religion and life belonged to different worlds.' He sketches the conflict between religion and science as it affected an undergraduate at Cambridge twenty odd years ago, and tells how he dwelt 'a lonely rebel in the land of negation and denial. It was during his time as an education officer at Liverpool that there came an experience which changed life for him. He was converted. When under very normal circumstances he was visiting a college friend, he found his friend 'was not alone.' 'Jesus was alive and present to my friend as he was to the eleven in the upper room. He was alive and present to me. . . . Jesus was objectively real, not subjectively realised.' Careful criticism, based on knowledge of modern psychology, did not seem to him to explain this experience as illusion, and thenceforward 'the experience of the reality of Jesus fixed the basis of my life's structure.' Life became a living relationship with the living Jesus. In this 'there is nothing final or static: knowledge grows, and appreciation changes. . . . I have tried to be frank with difficulties, to admit and explore criticisms, to hold my loyalty to Him subject to the approval of my reason, to recognize that there is much which many find difficult, and that my understanding of what seems to them defects may be mistaken. But if to say so suggests that I have not been satisfied, or that my belief is frail or my confession equivocal, I can only state roundly that He has grown in stature for me through the years, that He fulfils and transcends all that I can conceive of deity, and that, tested a myriad times, He has never failed to satisfy or to reveal under the test a richer perfection' (p. 110). As time passed Jesus was 'less plainly externalized but more continuously felt,' mediated through manifold natural sacraments. Events at

**A Wanderer's Way.* By Canon C. E. Raven, D.D. (Martin Hopkinson. Price 7/6 net. 1928.)

Emmanuel and at the War tested his experience. He was led, almost at once, to the conviction that he should serve Christ in the ministry of the Anglican Church, and devote his life's work to forwarding 'the New Reformation.'

This outline must suffice both to show the vitality and the character of Dr. Raven's religion, and to point to the question—the conception of the Indwelling Christ—which his narrative is intended to raise. The book has the perennial interest of sincerity and intellectual honesty. It is splendidly free from cant and morbidity. In some fine Christian evaluations and in the love and criticism of the Church we are reminded of Mr. Sheppard. Dr. Raven writes as one still upon his way, 'a beginner in discipleship,' but he goes no longer alone. Many have had a similar experience and some have written of it, but here the experience is renewed, has a certain freshness, an enthusiasm reminiscent of the Primitive Church.

In his preface Dr. Raven states that he has said 'little about the moral and intellectual failures' (and victories) because they are 'dull and unimportant.' We regret this. Without more such details, the story is bound to lack concreteness and definition. And further, Dr. Raven refers us to his other books for 'a full account of the scheme of thought,' to which his experiences led him. It would have multiplied the value of this book if Canon Raven, not having described in detail the way through which he journeyed, could have briefly surveyed the land from the vantage point to which he has attained. In books of this type it is not so much the general experience, though that may encourage, as some phase of the struggle, some turn of the thought that brings help to fellow-wanderers. For a man so notable as a scholar this book is curiously unintellectual. The spiritual experience seems primarily related to the feelings. We do not favour the cult of emotional detachment, nor on the other hand imagine that religion is merely a philosophy or idealism, when we suggest that there are many other thoughtful men in whom the intellectual activity is more immediately related to the spiritual experience. For such reasons some may feel a little disappointment in this book, and a few even distrust.

As it is the book has a sustained fervour truly remarkable. The flowing style carries us along and more rarely makes us halt to meditate. The prose lacks astringency and its persuasive forcefulness is weakened by being too monochromatic. It seems as though the prophetic fire and infectious enthusiasm of the writer had overruled somewhat the niceties of form. We venture this further criticism because there is a considerable group of educated opinion, out of touch with Christianity, who set a high value on literary qualities; and Canon Raven is one of the few men in the Church of England who can write for this group. His experiences, as this book amply shows, have led him into a deep sympathy with and understanding of their approach and difficulties; and he has the ability, and honesty, and courageous frankness which attracts them. To many Christians 'A Wanderer's Way' will be more than interesting, both as a human document and a record of Christian experience, and—let it be added—in its entertaining digressions. To his friends it will be welcome and illuminating.

H.G.M.

THESE LITTLE ONES.*

Spurgeon once told his Sunday School teachers that 'If you were all bottles and I wanted to fill you, I should not try to do it by squirting

**Child Psychology and Religious Education.* By Dorothy F. Wilson, B.Litt. (S.C.M. Pp. 160. Price 4/- and 2/6.)

over you all at once; but I should come to you one by one and *pour* the liquor into you one by one, slowly and gently . . . You cannot get a quartern loaf into a child all at once . . . So when you have a great mass of truth break it up small and give it to them with some nice warm milk of affection.' Where Spurgeon's advice has not been followed the result has been acute intellectual indigestion. But where it has been followed the method has provoked and justified the criticism of H. G. Wells (in *Joan and Peter*) that so many systems of education fail to evoke originality, to encourage initiative or to develop self-expression. But the reaction—as seen in the Montessori and other systems—has often gone to the other extreme, with the result that 'self-expression' has become almost a cant phrase. It has, for example, at times been overlooked that self-expression has little value apart from corresponding training to make the self worth expressing.

It is one of the great values of Miss Wilson's interesting book that it does justice to the old and the new schools while attempting to form a synthesis which will include the truth of both. To begin with, the writer abandons the 'doctrine of childish depravity' both in the traditional guise of 'original sin' and in the modern theories of Freud. The child is 'just a healthy little animal, largely guided by his instincts. These are not 'good' and 'bad' in themselves, though they may be 'higher' and 'lower.' The work of religious education is to strengthen the higher impulses and to help the child to gain control over the lower ones, so that he may live a life useful to himself, to the community and to God' (p. 24). This process must include the imparting of knowledge *authoritatively* as well as the training of the child to reason for itself, and so, to that extent, to become an authority to itself. Much useful work can be done here to stimulate the imagination by *suggestion*, and, while Miss Wilson clearly recognises the dangers of this, she gives many interesting illustrations of its potency when used wisely by teacher and parent. Again, in the question of the moral training of the child, Miss Wilson emphasises the need of a tactful approach: 'The wise teacher will show that he hopes and believes the best and will appeal to such motives as the thirst for heroism or desire to be thought manly: "that is unworthy of you" will be his line of appeal' (p. 111).

Miss Wilson shows a deep appreciation both of child experience and of child psychology, and her book should be in the hands of every one who has the responsibility of teaching children. We need only add that the Preface which Canon Streeter has contributed speaks of it as extremely readable and very sound.

J.P.H.

PERSONALITY AND MESSIAHSHIP.*

Mr. P. I. Painter has written a stimulating study of the life of Jesus in its relation to the Messianic hopes of His age. He approaches the problem by trying to appreciate the impression and influence of the personality of Jesus on His fellowmen, an influence which evoked strangely different feelings but which never left men unchanged. 'If,' asks Mr. Painter, 'at the end of a three years' intimacy with a carpenter of peasant extraction, living under the conditions described, these (disciples) had come to the conclusion that He was God's Messiah with authority to

**The Man of Nazareth. A study ni personality.* By P. I. Painter, B.A. (S.C.M. Pp. 222+xviii. Price 5/- and 3/6.)

dispense rewards, is not that in itself the most extraordinary tribute ever paid to such a man by his friends?' (p. 104). And Mr. Painter has the power of writing about the Mind of Jesus or the Law of Love so that we too feel 'a haunting impression of a living presence moving through the whole story and speaking in the authentic tones of reality.'

We are grateful, too, for a book which does justice to the Messianic elements in the teaching of Jesus and which acknowledges the Apocalyptic setting of His work without restricting His version to that of a 'child of his age.' Jesus accepted many of the apocalyptic beliefs of His age, but He was first and foremost a prophet, and, whatever the ways and forms He adopted, they were all calculated to drive home His message. From the outset He accepted the call to be the Chosen One, the Messiah—though He never used that word, preferring the title 'Son of Man.' After examining the various passages where Jesus might have seen that title used, Mr. Painter shows that the underlying conceptions were those of a 'representative man' (man as God meant him to be), the representative of God and the revealer of the secrets of God. 'It would be difficult to find a title that more accurately sums up Jesus' own conception of His work' (p. 29). Just because His conception of God, and therefore of His Messianic mission, was so much in advance of His age, He had continually to battle against a false popularity and a stifling traditionalism. The writer endeavours to reconstruct the course of Jesus' ministry on general lines and to show development in His teaching first to the populace and then to a selected group of followers. At the last Jesus courted death, but only because it was the one way left to Him to save His message from perishing and to compel others to grasp the meaning of His new revelation. And He was justified in His confidence in them, since, by death, He achieved His purpose. 'It was Jesus, not their own ideals of Messiahship, who survived and grew upon them until He filled their world' (p. 218).

This reconstruction is, of course, hypothetical, and on several points we do not agree with the writer's interpretation: the meaning, *e.g.*, which he finds in the phrase 'the coming of the Son of Man' (p. 154) seems too subtle for the disciples ever to have understood. But readers will find this study provocative of much thought. Since, however, Mr. Painter lays so much stress on the Messianic significance of the title 'Son of Man,' and since he suggests the suitability of this book for study circles, it is a pity that he nowhere mentions or calls attention to the difficulties which have been raised about the use of *Barnasha* in Aramaic. In consequence, he builds an argument up in one place (p. 128-9) on the two instances which many scholars quote as examples of the title being used with no Messianic significance at all. It would have been well if either here or in the bibliography reference had been made to the admirable pamphlet by Prof. A. S. Peake, *The Messiah and the Son of Man.*

J.P.H.

THE EXCELLENCE OF REVEALED RELIGION.*

The title of this book is derived from the Will of an eighteenth century clergyman. The Rev. John Hulse, B.A., 'felt . . . how inefficiently he had (from causes which he could not control) discharged his own spiritual functions; and sought . . . to effect through the agency of others the good which he could so well design, though physical rather than spiritual

**The Man of Nazareth. A study in personality.* By P. I. Painter, B.A. (S.C.M. Essay for 1927. (Cambridge University Press, 1928. Price 5/-.)

and mental weakness had deprived him of the power to execute them' (Parkinson, quoted p.v.). With this end in view, he bequeathed a considerable benefaction to the University of Cambridge; and part of the emoluments of this benefaction was to be given as an annual prize for 'the best Dissertation on the evidence in general, or on the prophecies and miracles in particular, or on any particular argument, whether the same be direct or collateral proofs, of the Christian or revealed religion, in order to evince its truth and excellence.' We venture to hazard that John Hulse would have heartily commended both the choice of subject and the award for 1927; and have hoped that Mr. Challenger, as 'a learned and ingenious person' (p. vi) might share in some other part of his endowment at some future date. At any rate, he would have felt gratification at being the immediate cause of such a scholarly piece of work.

Mr. Challenger, like Professor Webb, pleads for the abandonment of the 'classical' view of Revelation. It is (he holds) no longer possible to divide all religions into two categories, natural and revealed, and to identify Christianity with the latter, and all other religions, philosophies, and superstitions, with the former. A study of the essential meaning of revelation shows that at least all the higher religions possess revelational elements. For revelation means primarily the discovery of religious truth, and such discovery is not confined to the limits of the Christian Church. Revelation, thus understood, is almost always made to (or, viewed from the human side, by) outstanding personalities; hence the Prophet is the primary organ of revelation (here Mr. Challenger follows Herder, p. 70). It is the Prophet's function to transmit his discovery to others, and theirs to receive it. 'The Prophet is able to inspire others because they are *potentially* capable of receiving the same inspiration which he, with his heightened faculties, has received. *Actually*, they can only receive the message which he imparts. Their inspiration is inspiration at *second-hand*' (p. 89). The Scriptures are obviously the record of such prophetic revelations, and hence are also 'in a sense *Revelation at second hand*' (p. 56). Mr. Challenger is thoroughly modern here. He also agrees with the most modern philosophy of religion on the two fundamental points—he recognises the autonomy of the religious consciousness, and he recognises the objective character of all experience (what Brentano, following the Scholastics, describes as *intentionality*) (pp. 96, 93*f.*).

The greater part of the essay, however, is devoted to the history of the concept of Revelation in the Christian Church. The author shows how this has constantly changed. Probably in theory the most characteristic form of the relation of faith and reason has been the Augustinian-Anselmian *credo ut intelligam*. But philosophy has constantly attempted to assert its independent claim, and Mr. Challenger shows how the priority of *fides* to *ratio*, which became in Bonaventura that of *sapientia* to *scientia*, historically developed into the scepticism of William of Occam. The volume also contains an interesting discussion of the concept among Hulse's contemporaries.

The book abounds, as a prize essay should, with information. We venture to think that there are few scholars who will not be able from its perusal to glean some facts with which they were hitherto unacquainted. Its matter and reasoning are somewhat compressed; but this is a defect from which any attempt to cover the whole history of one of the fundamental concepts of religion in less than a hundred pages could hardly escape.

C.L.F.

CORRESPONDENCE

INTERCOMMUNION IN CHINA.

SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman.*

For some years I have desired to express my thanks for the hope and encouragement that your articles give to a missionary, and to ask whether it would not be possible to organize some public avowal of the growing conviction that our denominational exclusiveness does not represent, to many Church people, the Mind of Christ. Now Canon Raven's frank words in his Jerusalem article embolden me to approach you.

If the next Lambeth Conference is to make a decided move towards unity it will only be because the laity have shown clearly that they are ready for it. The part of those in high authority is surely to guard, not to lead. Is it in *Il Santo* or in De Lammenais' *Memoires* that the Pope stops the would-be reformer by asking him to admire a beautiful carved bit of ivory of the fourteenth century, and then adds: 'This was handed down to me by my predecessors, and I must hand it on to my successors in the same condition as it reached me'? The Pillars of the Church uphold. 'It would be sad,' remarked one, 'if the Pillars became rolling stones.' The priests, bearing the sacred Ark, were to stand in the midst of Jordan till all the people were gone over into the Promised Land.

Again and again we are warned to go with patience and slowly—though we may be convinced that 'the King's business requireth haste': we know we must avoid giving offence, but the time has come for some kind of protest.

Some years ago, when a terrible famine had drawn Christians of many Churches into the closest bonds of fellowship in service, their separation at the Feast of Unity became a heavy burden to several. One proposed to hold a solemn service of Spiritual Communion. Sanctioned by the Roman Church, habitually practised by the Friends, it was hoped that such a Communion—without celebrant, without elements—could be open to no misconstruction and might supply what we so earnestly desired till the last barriers came down. The idea was very warmly received. The service was led by the ministers of three different Churches, including the Church of England, and was very well attended.

To some of us free intercommunion seems to first step towards mutual recognition on equal terms, but there are practical difficulties. Could not the various fellowships and forward-looking groups organize such services of Spiritual Communion to be held annually on some special day—Maundy Thursday suggests itself—at which we could affirm our belief in the 'One Catholic and Apostolic Church' without danger and without offence?

Again thanking you for all that your journal means to those who are far from the mental and spiritual stimulation of the home Church.

A. G. BOWDEN-SMITH.

Peking, North China.
July 22, 1928.

DEAN RASHDALL'S THEOLOGY.

SIR,

May I, as a layman who has been deeply interested in the Christological problem for many years, venture to make a suggestion which, as it seems to me, may serve to unify the Traditionalist and the Modernist points of view?

The Traditionalist view is, I presume, based on the credal expression that our Lord was 'of one substance with the Father.'

What are we to understand by 'substance'? We have high authority for saying that 'God is Spirit.' May we not then regard 'substance' as identical with Spirit? Can there be a more comprehensive or more intelligible category?

Our Lord, as we believe, was completely indwelt by the Spirit of God. He was therefore, in the fullest sense, 'of one substance with the Father.' It is in this way that we speak of His Divinity, or, if the expression be preferred, His Godhead. With regard to His pre-existence, Dr. Rashdall says: 'Catholic doctrine does not . . . make the human Jesus pre-exist . . . It was the divine Logos that pre-existed, not the human Jesus. (*The Idea of Atonement,* p. 444). Dr. William Temple says: 'Clearly it is the Logos—the Divine Humanity—that pre-exists. "The finite centre of consciousness" (Jesus) had a beginning' (*Foundations,* p. 249).

The doctrine of the Trinity, or the three-foldness of Spirit, is, I take it, for us, economic, though we may believe that it stands for something eternal in the nature of God.

Dr. Temple says: 'By the identification of Will and Substance there is, I think, a reconciliation of the "Incarnationist" and "Adoptionist" positions' (*Foundations,* p. 248). I would suggest that by the identification of Spirit and Substance the Christological problem is practically solved.

CHARLES E. HOWE.

The Haven, Old Colwyn, N. Wales.
13th November, 1928.

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

SIR,

The article on the story of the burial and resurrection that appeared in the August number of the *Modern Churchman* moves me to write to you on a subject which is so often treated very fancifully and without regard to the fact that our earliest authority for the details of the burial and the finding of the empty tomb is St. Mark, and that every detail added to the account given in St. Mark stand under suspicion and demands the strictest investigation before it can be accepted. I note, for instance, that Mr. Royds speaks of our Lord's 'embalmed body.'

St. Mark's story is as follows:—Late on Friday our Lord's body was taken down from the Cross by friends who could not bear that it should remain exposed there. They wrapped it in linen and placed it in a tomb hewn in the rock, and rolled a stone against the entrance. Two women were watching where He was laid (we are not told that they both took any part in the burial). The burial was evidently hurried, and the tomb would be near at hand. The women (they alone) determined to complete what was wanting in reverent burial of the body of our Lord, and as soon as possible, when the Sabbath was over, they purchased spices and very early on the Sunday morning they with one other went to the tomb which they to their astonishment found open. They entered into the tomb and saw a young man in white apparel sitting on the right and were terrified. The young man addressed them in the words: 'Be not terrified, ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, He that was crucified; He is risen, He is not here. Lo the place where they (not "*ye*") laid Him. But go tell His disciples and Peter that

He goes before you into Galilee; there shall ye see Him, as He told you.' The women fled, frightened out of their wits, and told no one, for they were afraid. With these words St. Mark's gospel abruptly closes.

We can realize that this story, used to prove the actual resurrection of our Lord's earthly body, is and was subject to formidable objections. It would be at once asked: Has it been made clear that the tomb that the women visited on Sunday was the same as that they were watching on Friday? St. Mark's account suggests that Joseph and his friends had no interest in the position of the tomb. They wished to save the body from exposure and they decently placed it in the tomb, some cave perhaps near at hand, and we are not told that they had the least intention to do anything more. Were there other tombs or caves both open and closed in the neighbourhood with one of which the one chosen might have been confused by the women? Remember that they saw the burial late on Friday and visited the tomb very early on Sunday. These doubts are answered in the developed tradition of the later gospels. The tomb was no chance cave; it was a new tomb—Joseph's own tomb—it was in a garden—it was publicly sealed and guarded so that no one could have stolen the body—it was entered on Friday by the women so that they could see *how*, not only *where* He was laid—nay, the burial was completed on Friday evening with all due rite and ceremony, and Mary Magdalene went on Sunday only to visit the tomb and then brought others to see that it was empty. No mistake could therefore have been made. But these additional details only show the historian how early it was felt that St. Mark's account required amplification and correction to make it acceptable from the point of view of apologetics.

In the story of the visit to the tomb two facts stand out quite clearly. In the first place the story was not told until some considerable time had elapsed after the event. St. Mark says: 'The women told no one,' not 'the women intended to tell no one,' as if he were perhaps about to record something happening immediately afterwards that made them change their minds. We may conclude that the story was told after the subsequent appearances in Galilee which St. Mark was evidently about to narrate. In the second place the women were terrified, they fled from the tomb out of their wits with fright. Why was this so? Evidently because of what they saw; the message they received was such as to fill them not with fright, but with hope; they would burn to tell it to their friends, as the later gospels say they did. Again, their fright would render them not very trustworthy witnesses as to what they may have heard. The recorded message is then seen to be out of harmony with the conduct of the women who received it. It is also out of harmony with the previous record in St. Mark. It presupposes that the disciples and Peter were at hand and had not fled as St. Mark tells us at the time of the betrayal. One tends to forget how dangerous it was for any disciple of one who had been executed on the charge of treason against the Roman power to remain within the province of the Roman procurator (St. Peter's experience at the trial emphasizes this fact). Considerations like these force one to the conclusion that the words of the message are not to be trusted; but that the story does give us clearly to understand that the women visited the tomb, that they were assured that it was empty, and that they received there a vision of a young man clothed in white apparel, a vision which caused them to flee from the tomb in a panic of fright.

Those frightened women would not have dared to go near the place again to find out whether they had a mistake about the tomb. After, however, they had returned to Galilee and had heard of the appearances of our

Lord to St. Peter and other disciples they would be absolutely certain that they had made no mistake. The Lord had appeared in Galilee—that was why the tomb was empty; and their story which they now told would naturally take the form that we find in St. Mark—they had received at the tomb a vision of a heavenly messenger who had appeared to bid them prepare the disciples for what actually had happened.

The women were the only persons present at the burial that seem to have had any interest in marking the exact place where our Lord's body was laid. After the appearances in Galilee they would be absolutely certain that the tomb that they visited on Sunday morning was the right one, and it is difficult to see how anyone who might have cared to take the trouble would have been able to test whether or no they had made a mistake. This means that it is simply useless to speculate about what happened to our Lord's body. We are absolutely dependent upon the evidence of the women.

As to what happened to the women on the Sunday morning, it seems to me that so-called 'natural' explanations are altogether on the wrong lines. We know from St. Paul that at this time St. Peter and many others believed that they had seen our Lord. Why may not the women have had a similar 'supernatural' experience at the tomb, a vision that frightened them out of their wits? It was afterwards interpreted as a vision of an angel. Was it not perhaps a vision of our Lord Himself? One remembers the story of the walk to Emmaus in St. Luke and of the appearance at the Lake in St. John.

J. R. WILKINSON.

Winford Rectory,
Bristol.

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

SIR,

There is one interesting point with regard to the tradition concerning the Empty Tomb which Mr. Royds has not touched upon in his valuable paper. I refer to the possibility that one of the earliest sources of the Gospels did not represent the women as actually finding the tomb empty. Many scholars are of opinion that St. Mark's Gospel is itself composite, and any who studies the accounts given in it of the Agony in the garden, the trials of Christ before the Sanhedrin and Pilate, St. Peter's denials, etc., will see that there is at any rate a case for enquiry. To me it seems highly probable that St. Mark xvi, 1—8, are a combination of two sources: the one consisting roughly of vv. 2 and 5—7, the other of vv. 1—3, 4, 8. If the latter be read consecutively (omitting the words 'going out' in v. 8, which may well be an editorial addition, suggested by the 'entering in' in v. 5), it will be seen that we have an intelligible and consistent narrative, in which no mention is made of the tomb being empty. It is easy to understand why the women should have fled in panic when they saw the stone rolled away, and said nothing to any man; it is not easy to understand why they should so have fled, after the reassuring words of the young man, nor why they should have kept silence when they had been given a message to deliver to the disciples. In this connection it is worth noting that neither St. Matthew nor St. Luke reproduces St. Mark's statement that 'they said nothing to any man,' in fact they both flatly contradict it.

ERIC REDE BUCKLEY.

Polstead Rectory.